SOME RECENTLY FOUND GREEK POEMS

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

A. D. LEEMAN · H. W. PLEKET · C. J. RUIJGH

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C. J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM NONAGESIMUM NONUM

J. M. BREMER
A. MARIA VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP
S. R. SLINGS

SOME RECENTLY FOUND GREEK POEMS

SOME RECENTLY FOUND GREEK POEMS

TEXT AND COMMENTARY

BY

J. M. BREMER
A. MARIA VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP
S. R. SLINGS

E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KØBENHAVN • KÖLN
1987

The publication of this book was made possible through a grant from the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.).

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Bremer, Jan Maarten.
Some recently found Greek poems.

(Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum; 99)
Includes indexes.
1. Manuscripts, Greek (Papyri) 2. Greek poetry. 3. Archilochus—Manuscripts. I. Erp Taalman Kip, A. Maria van (Anna Maria), 1935- . II. Slings, S. R. III. Title. IV. Series.
PA3319.A2 1987 881'.01'08 87-23850
ISBN 90-04-08319-7 (pbk.)

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 08319 7

© Copyright 1987 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS BY E. J. BRILL

CONTENTS

List of Plates VI

Introduction VII

A) Archilochus: Poem(s) in iambic trimeters 1
B) Archilochus: 'First Cologne Epode' 24
C) Archilochus: 'Second Cologne Epode' (fr. 188) 62
D) Anonymus: Commentary on Poem(s) of Hipponax 70
E) Alcaeus: 'Aias and Kassandra' 95
F) Stesichorus: 'The Lille papyrus' 128

Bibliography 173
Index locorum 175
Index verborum 177

LIST OF PLATES

1. Archilochus, *P. Oxy.* 2310, fr. 1. (col. i. 1-39 = *A*).
2. Archilochus, *P. Colon.* inv. 7511 = *P. Köln* 58. (1-35 = *B*; 36-40 = *C*).
3. Hipponax, *P. Oxy.* 2176, fr. 1 + 9 (col. i = *D* I; col. ii = *D* II).
4. Hipponax, (left) *P. Oxy.* 2176, fr. 3 + 4 + 5. (= *D* III), (right) *P. Oxy.* 2176, fr. 2 + 8 + unnumbered fr. + *P. Oxy.* 1233, fr. 29. (= *D* 5).
5. Alcaeus, *P. Oxy.* 2303, a.
6. Alcaeus, *P. Colon.* 2021.
7. Stesichorus, *P. Lille* 76 Ai, 76 Aii, 73 i, 73 ii.
   Inset: Stesichorus, *P. Lille* 111 C.
8. Stesichorus, *P. Lille* 76 Ci, 76 Cii, 76 B.

Credits

Photographs for plates 1, 3, 4 and 5 by courtesy of the Egypt Exploration Society, London.

Photographs for plates 2 and 6 by courtesy of the Institut für Altertumskunde, Cologne.

Photographs for plates 7 and 8 by courtesy of l'Institut de Papyrologie et d'Egyptologie de l'Université de Lille III.

INTRODUCTION

Greek literary papyrology has brought many new witnesses for texts already known from medieval manuscripts; more exciting are, of course, the discoveries of texts hitherto unknown. There was a golden age up to and around 1900 during which poets emerged in full splendour: Alcman, Bacchylides, to name two of them. More than half a century later a silver age followed bringing some new plays of Menander, one of them 100% complete. The present period is not yet the iron age: even now important new fragments are being produced by heroic efforts, especially since mummy cartonnages have begun to be 'deconstructed' systematically. These new fragments deserve the same threefold treatment as their more illustrious predecessors: (1) a first edition, (2) numerous suggestions in detail for constitution and interpretation of the text in scholarly periodicals, (3) the bringing together of these manifold contributions into a carefully constituted text and a full commentary.

The authors of the present book hope to have done the third job for some substantial new fragments of Alcaeus (A. M. van Erp Taalman Kip), Archilochus and Hipponax (S. R. Slings), Stesichorus (J. M. Bremer). Each of us has seen, and contributed to, the individual work of each of the two others. Even so, we have asked and found help in many quarters. Our first debt of gratitude is towards those colleagues who sent photographs, and afterwards received us and allowed us to inspect the original papyri at leisure: C. Meillier (Lille) for Stesichorus, J. Rea and R. Coles (Oxford) for Archilochus and Hipponax, the staff of the Institut für Altertumskunde (Cologne) for Alcaeus and Archilochus.

A provisional and partial draft of our work was discussed in Amsterdam on 8-9 May 1984; partners in the discussion were R. Führer (Hamburg), P. Parsons (Oxford), S. L. Radt (Groningen), C. J. Ruijgh (Amsterdam). Several of their suggestions have been adopted by us; whenever one of their names appears in our commentaries without a page-number, it is understood that the suggestion was given at that occasion. The manuscript of the contributions by S. R. Slings was finished in August 1984 (publications that appeared after this date could be taken into account only occasionally), those of the contributions by J. M. Bremer and A. M. van Erp Taalman Kip were finished in November 1985. P. J. Sijpesteijn read the complete manuscript and helped us in removing several mistakes or imprecisions. K. A. Worp assisted two of us more especially: his sharp eye and his experience as a papyrologist has been of great value. The Fondation Hardt pour les études classiques gave

Bremer the opportunity of working on Stesichorus in June 1985. The Dutch Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research contributed funds towards the costs of the May 1984 meeting and also towards the costs of the present publication. Three ladies deserve the credit for bringing our manuscripts into typescripts: I. Sluiter (Archilochus, Hipponax), H. M. de Schepper and M. P. v.d. Wiel (Stesichorus and Alcaeus). Mr. H. A. Mulder has been very helpful in removing the worst mistakes from our English. Finally, we thank the editors of the Supplementa Mnemosyne for receiving our book in their series.

University of Amsterdam, J. M. Bremer
A. Maria van Erp Taalman Kip
Free University S. R. Slings

A ARCHILOCHUS

POEM(S) IN IAMBIC TRIMETERS

I treat here the first thirty-nine lines of *P.Oxy.* 2310, fr. 1 col. i. Line 40 is too short to be an iambic trimeter; it is the title of a new poem commencing in 41 (fr. 25 W.). Line 42 coincides with a known fragment of Archilochus, as do lines 5f. of col. ii (fr. 26 W.). Three other fragments of this roll have been preserved, but nothing much can be learned from them.

Archilochean authorship of our thirty-nine lines is strongly suggested by these facts, and also by details of metre and diction. The circumstance that the lines are difficult to interpret (whether they are taken as belonging to one single poem or to more) is probably the cause of mistrust or rejection of their authenticity by several scholars (A. Colonna, BPEC 7, 1959, 51-53; Giordano; Gallavotti; S. M. Medaglia, *Note di esegesi archilochea*, Roma 1982, 125-127), and given our lacunary knowledge of the lyrical language and Archilochus' tendency to experiment with it, arguments are easily found once mistrust has arisen (some of my notes deal implicitly with such arguments). The same reaction was to be seen twenty years later when the Cologne fragment (*B*) was published.

The roll is written in a hand dated by Lobel about the middle of the second century AD; it is roughly of the same type as that of the Cologne Archilochus, but less regular. Accentuation agrees with our habits; in addition, a grave accent (used in the normal way in 9 μὴ) can be used to indicate that the next syllable is accentuated (9 τετρὰμηνης, 11 ανὸλβειης; even when the next syllable is in fact elided: 13 εὶμ'). In one case, where the accent is typical of Ionic, both conventions are combined: 10 τὶθεῦ. Punctuation consists of the high point only; a sparing use is made of apostrophos (there is no *scriptio plena*); the *trema* is always written on word-initial iota (10 ϊλ.ον), as well as on 22 νη̣ϊ. Iota adscript is not used (except in corrections or later additions: 19 and 21). There is an (illegible) interlinear note in 23; of the variant readings and corrections, some are in the first hand (8·ουσ·; 21 τοι̣) and belong to the paradosis; others are written with a thinner pen (as are most accents) and slightly cursive—these mostly normalize Ionic forms (11 ἐς to εἰς 21 ἔσεαι to ἔσηι). There is one intriguing critical sign in 19 (cf. ad loc.), and a forked paragraphus (cf. *D*, ad II 11-14) underneath col. ii, 11 (probably marking the beginning of a new poem).

I examined the papyrus, with the help of an excellent microscope (this also goes for *B* - *D*), at Oxford in October 1981. Where subsequent editors differ from Lobel, I have almost always found the latter to be right; hence I present my own deviations from his readings (the major ones are discussed in the notes) with some hesitation, especially because of the bad preservation of the material. Editors should always be extremely cautious in drawing conclusions from photographs, and especially in the case of this wretched papyrus.

]· ·[
]· · · ·[ ]·[· ·]·[
]· · ·[ ]·[· ·]·[· · ·]·[· ·]ν[
]· · · · ·[· ·]· ·[· ·]· · · · · · · · ·γε̣·[
]· · · · ·[· ·]· · · · · · · ·α̣·ἐρ̣γματ̣[
]·[]·[· ·]· ·σ̣·[·]· ·[· · ·]· · · · · ·α̣· · · ·βε̣ω [
]·[]· ·βα· · · · ·ε̣ τὴ̣ν̣ δ̣'ἐγὼ̣ν̣τ̣α̣μειβόμ[ην·
γύνα[ι], φάτιν μὲν τὴν π̣ρ̣ὸς ἀνθρώπω[ν κακὴν
μὴ τετραμήνῃς μη̣δέ(ν)· ἀμφὶ δ' εὐ̣φ[ρον-
ἐμοὶ μελήσει· θ̣υμὸν ἵλ·ον τιθεῦ.
ἐ̣ς τοῦτο̣ δή τοι τῆς ἀνο̣λ̣β{ε̣}ί̣ης δοκ̣[έω
ἥ̣κειν̣; ἀ̣νήρ το̣ι δειλὸς ἆρ̣' ἐ̣φαινό̣μην̣ [
οὐ]δ' οἷός εἰμ' ἐγω̣ὐτ̣ὸς οὐδ' οἵων ἄπο̣.
ἐπ]ί̣στα̣μαί τοι τὸν φιλε̣ῦ̣ντα̣ μὲν φ[ι]λ̣έειν̣ [
τὸ]ν̣ δ̣' ἐχθρὸν ἐχθ{ρ̣}αι̣ρειν̣ τε̣ [κα]ὶ̣ κακο[
μύ]ρ̣μηξ. λογω· ·υν τ̣[· · · · · ·]θείη πάρ[·
πό]λιν δὲ̣ τ̣αύτη[ν· · ·]·[· · · · ·]πιστρε̣[· · ·]·[ ]
· ·]τ̣οι ποτ' ἄνδρες ἐ̣ξε̣[· · · · ·]σαν· σὺ δὲ
ν]ῦ̣ν εἷλες αἰχμῆ⟦ν⟧ κ̣α̣[ὶ μέγ' ἐ]ξήρα[ο] κ̣[λ]έ̣ο̣ς ̣ ̣) [
]κείνης ἄνα̣σσε κα̣ὶ τ̣[υραν]νίην ἔχ̣ε̣·
τοι̣
]π[ο]λ̣[λοῖ]σ̣ι̣ [·]η̣[· ζ]η̣λωτὸς ἀ[νθρ]ώπων̣ ἔσε̣α̣ι.
] νη̣ΐ σὺν σ̣[μ]ι̣κρῇ μέγαν
πόντον περή]σας ἦλθες ἐκ Γορτυνί̣ης
]· · ·οτ̣· · · ·π̣ε̣·εστάθη⟦ν⟧
] κ̣αὶ τόδ' ἁρπαλ̣[ί]ζομ[αι]
]·γυης ἀφικ[
]·μοισιν ε̣·[· · · · · · ·]·ς
] χεῖρα καὶ π[αρ]εστ̣[ά]θη̣· [
]·ού̣σας, φ̣[ο]ρτίων̣ δέ μοι μέ[λ]ε̣ι̣
]·ος εἴτ' ἀπώλετο
]ν ἐ̣σ̣τ̣ι̣ μ̣ηχανὴ
]λο̣. οὔτιν' εὐ̣ρ̣οίμην ἐγὼ
εἰ σ]ε̣ κῦμ' ἁλὸς κατέκλυσεν
]·ν χερσὶν α̣ἰχμη̣τέων ὑπὸ

ἥ]βη̣ν ἀγλ̣α̣ὴν ἀπ[ώ]λ̣ε̣σ̣α̣ς.
ἀν]θε̣ῖ̣ καί σ̣ε θε[ὸς ἐ]ρ⟨ρ⟩ύσ̣α̣το
37 (16)].[.]. .κἀ̣μὲ̣ μουνωθέντ' ἴδ..
]ν̣ ἐν ζόφῳ̣ δὲ κείμενο̣ς
] ἐ̣ς φάο̣[ς κ]ατεστάθην.

Diacritic and punctuation signs; *corrections and variants* (see also notes on 7, 15, 23, 24, 31)

8 θ\ουσ/ρῶπ 9 μὴτετρὰ μη.ε⟦μ̣⟧\ν/ 10 σει· ϊλ τὶθεῦ· 11 ε̣\ι/στοῦ ὀ̣λ̣β 12 ἆρ̣ε̣ 13 δοῖοσεὶμ'ὲ ου\δ/ιωνάπο̣· 15]\δ/εχ κὰκο[16 πάρ̣.[18]σαν·συ 19 χμηι⟦ν̣⟧ 20 ε̣χ̣.· 21]σ̣.[.]\το/ἡ[εσ̣εα̣\ηι/ι 22]ν.ι· 35 fort. αγ.̣`ην 36]θε̣ῖ̣ 37 ντϊδ..

Supplements and corrections

In principle, I do not record readings that are contradicted by the traces, but I have been on the liberal side (also, I have adopted some readings that may shed light on what Archilochus wrote, even when they are in themselves impossible). From line 22 onwards, "West" refers to West 1974.

4 γε̣.[: γει̣[West ε[.]γε.[fort. ε[ὐ]γεν̣[- Peek.

5 .α̣.: γὰρ̣ vel σ̣ά̣φ' Peek; ἔργματα Adrados.

6 ν̣ σεβέω Lasserre-Bonnard (σεβεω iam Lobel).

7 πικρὸν μὲν εἶπε· τῆι δὲ πίκρ' ἠμειβόμην Peek στροιβᾶν δέ. ῥήσει τῆιδ' ἔπειτ' ἠμειβόμην Lasserre (ἔπειτ' legi nequit) στροιβᾶν δ' ἔοικε καί σε πίκρ' ἀμείβομαι Giannini (καί σε legi nequit) μάκρ' ἠμειβόμην Adrados τὴν δ' ἐγὼνταμειβόμην Ebert-Luppe.

8 κακήν Lobel κακῶν Lasserre 1956.

9 Εὐφρ- (gen.) Peek εὐφρόνων Lasserre 1956 εὔφρονα Lasserre-Bonnard εὔφρονος Slings εὐφρόνηι West εὐκλέος Kamerbeek δὲ ψόγων Carey (legi nequit).

10 ἵλαον Lobel ἵλεον Latte.

11 εἰ (ἐ)ς Steffen; ἀνολβίης Chantraine.

13 οἶ⟨σθ'⟩ ὅς Maas; ἐγωὐτὸς Peek ἐγὼ [.]ὑτὸς Lobel ἐγὼ [ο]ὗτος West.

15 κακοῖς δακεῖν Bossi κακορραφέειν Latte κακορροθέειν Schiassi κακοστομέειν Lobel κακοφρονέειν Giannini κακοῦν ἅτε Slings 1982 κακώμεναι Garzya.

16 Μύρμηξ Peek; λόγων νυν Lobel λόγωι μὲν Peek (non fuit μέν) λόγων οὖν Adrados λόγωι νῦν Lasserre; τῶιδε μὴ θείη πάρα vel τῶιδ' ἀληθείη πάρα Peek (ἀλ. πάρα iam Lobel) τῶιδε βυσθείη πάρος vel σὺν τῶιδε κρυφθείη πάρος Latte τῶιδε πεισθείη πάρος Giannini τῶι δ' Mette τείνομ' ἰθείηι πάρα Gallavotti.

17 τῆς vel τὴν...ἐπιστρέφεαι Lobel ἣν (ἧς Schiassi) σὺ νῦν ἐπι- Peek ἥν γε νῦν Giordano μάλα σὺ νῦν Giannini ἣν λαβὼν Gallavotti; ἐπιστρεφέως Slings τῆι νόημ' ἐπιστρέφεις Kamerbeek.

18 οὔ τοι Lobel ἄλλοι Adrados δῆιοι Latte θετοὶ vel ταγοὶ Gallavotti ἣν σοί Lasserre; ἐξεπόρθησαν Lobel ἐξετείχισαν Mette; σύδην Gallavotti.

19 τὴν εἷλες Lobel κἀνεῖλες Mette νῦν εἷλες West; καὶ μέγ' ἐξῆρας κλέος Lobel ἐξήραο Adrados.

20 καὶ τυραννίην Lobel κἀπικερδίην Latte.

21 πολλοῖσι δὴ ζηλωτὸς et τοι s.l. Peek πολλοῖς δὲ δὴν Gallavotti πᾶσιν σὺ δὴ ζηλ. Latte πηι ζηλ. et που s.l. Lasserre θην ζηλ. West μὴν ζηλ. H. Poortvliet (privatim) πρῶτος Adrados; ηι supra ἔσεαι Lobel η Gallavotti.

22 voc. δὴ νῦν Peek voc. χαῖρε West Μύρμηξ, μελαίνηι Steffen πάλαι ποθητὸς Gallavotti τοῖος γὰρ αὐτὸς Schiassi.

23 γόμον κομίσσας Giordano φόρτον (Lobel) κομίσσας Peek χρυσὸν κομ. Schiassi πόντον περάσσας vel μετρήσας Steffen πόντον περήσας Adrados ἐς ἡμ]έας Lasserre χώρ]ας Morel.

24 ἧι πλοῖον ἤδη πρὸ τρίτης ἐπεστάθη Gallavotti στρατηγὸς ἐστάθης (Peek) legi nequit, παρεστάθης Adrados ὅτι τ' ἐπ{εσ}εστάθη Slings.

25 βραδέως μέν, ἀλλὰ Peek ἐγὼ δὲ χαίρω Steffen τά τ' ἄλλ' ἀκούω Schiassi τά τ' ἄλλα λείπω Giannini φήμη γὰρ ἧκε Gallavotti.

26 καὶ γύης Peek κρηγύης Lasserre ὅσον τε φωνῆς κρ. Gallavotti οὐ δὴ 'πὶ νηὸς κρ. West.

27 ἰδὼν δέ σ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν Peek; ἐξέστην φρενῶν vel ἐξενωμένον Schiassi ἐξήϋσα τρίς Giannini ἐξαίφνης ἐμοῖς Steffen στολμοῖσιν ἐξειργασμένοις Peek ὡς χοιράδα στολμοῖσιν ἐξαλευμένοις Gallavotti γάμοισιν ἐξηρτυμένοις Lasserre ἐσθλοῖσιν ὀφθ. ἐξηρτυμένης West.

28 θεὸς δὲ προέσχε West προύτεινες αὖτε Slings ὠρεξάμην σοὶ Peek (melius τοι) κὠρεξάμην τε Giannini ἅπαντα νῦν πρόχειρα Gallavotti; παρεστάθης Adrados -θην Peek.

29 ἀκ]ούσας Peek μάλ' αἶψ' ἀκ. Giannini φωνῆς ἀκούσας Steffen ὀρούσας Lasserre μάλ' αἶψ' ὀρ. Schiassi κέρδος κολούσας West; μέλει Peek μέλοι Steffen μέγα Giannini.

30 ἥκιστ' ἂν οὐδὲ νηὸς Steffen ἥκιστα, σέο σωθέντος vel σωισθέντος West οὐδὲν vel οὐ πάμπαν vel εἴτ' ὧν ἐσώθη νηὸς...οὐδέν Slings εἰ κύματός γ' ἐστ' ἐκτός Schiassi εἴτ' οὖν ἐσώθη, χόνδρος Gallavotti (melius ὦν) οὐδ' ἄλλος εἴτε σῶος Peek οὐκ ἔμελεν εἴτ' ἦν ἐντὸς Giannini]. ὅς Adrados.

31 Με]νέστα Peek ἔ]νθ⟦ο⟧α Lasserre ἐστ' ἀμηχάνη Adrados τούτοισι μὲν vel γὰρ (μὴν Giannini) κακοῖσ' ἔνεστι Schiassi φίλον δὲ σῴζειν οὐκ ἔνεστι Steffen εἴτ' οὖν τις ᾖ φέροις ἂν ἐστι West (melius ὦν et σῴζοιτ') τούτων γὰρ ἴσθι μᾶλλόν ἐστι Gallavotti.

32 τοῖον δ' ἂν ἄλλον Steffen (ἂν iam Lobel) φίλον δ' ἂν ἄλλον Fränkel (γαμβρὸν West) ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἁπλῶς Peek ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἄλλως Schiassi οὔ]λως Slings.

33 εἴ σ]ε̣ Peek, ante quae γέλων ἔτ' Giannini ἑταῖρον Steffen τοιοῦτον Fränkel χαρὰν ἔτ' Peek χάριν περ Schiassi.

34 ad in. ἤ Peek ἢ γῆς ἐπ' ἀνδρῶν Slings ἤπειτα λῃστῶν Gallavotti ἢ τῆλ' ἑταίρων Peek (ἀφ' ἡμέων Steffen).

35 ἤβην Lobel ante quod ἁλωτὸς Slings δύσμοιρος Giordano ληφθεὶς ποτ' (sic) Gallavotti λυγρῶς μάλ' Schiassi παρ' αἶσαν Steffen πρόμοιρος Peek.

36 ἀνῆλ]θες Peek (alii alia) legi nequit, νῦν (iam Peek) δ' ἡ μὲν ἀνθεῖ West νῦν πάντ' ἐπανθεῖ Gallavotti κείνη νυν ἀνθεῖ Slings; ἐρύσατο Gallavotti.

37 θανόντα μή σε (melius μή σε) κἀμὲ (Lobel) μουν. ἴδῃ Peek (ἴδῃς Lobel ἴδῃις Lasserre) μή σε φθαρέντα Steffen μή τίς σε νεκρὸν Gallavotti; ἰδὼν Slings.

38 νῦ]ν vel νῦν ἠλλάγη (vel ἐτράπη) πᾶ]ν Peek ἀλλ' ἐτράπετο πᾶν Schiassi αὐτὸς δ' ἀνέστην Gallavotti στυγνόν τ' ἄθυμον Steffen τὸ πρὶν χάμαι μὲν Fränkel; κείμενο⟨ς⟩ Lobel -νο⟨ν⟩ Lasserre.

39 αὖτις] Peek, ante quod ἡ λευκὸν Gallavotti πάρος περ Peek τὸ πρόσθεν Steffen τὸ πρῶτον West τὸ πρίν, πάλιν νῦν] Slings ὀρθὸς] Fränkel.

5 .α̣.: Both γὰρ and σάφ' possible, though γὰρ is perhaps to be preferred (σάφα is rather poetic; it is not found elsewhere in iambus and elegy). For ἐργματ̣[cf. fr. 132.

6 βε̣ω: σεβέω is possible, εὐσεβέω is not. West's ι̣χα̣..ω was inspired by the photograph: the original does not suggest it.

7 Given the probability of τὴν δ' ἐγὼνταμειβόμην, one would think of a concluding formula like τοσαῦτ' ἐφώνει (*B*, 6; cf. 28); the only one proposed is Peek's πικρὸν μὲν εἶπε (roughly the correct number of letters, the ρ and the final ε fit, but his μ is in fact α).

We shall probably have to accept that the woman's speech ended in the middle of the line (compare the ἀντιλαβή in Hippon. fr. 25 W. = 35 Deg. and the end of the fable in the middle of a line, Archil. fr. 181, 12, cf. *Studi* I 8); cf. Führer, 66. The traces fit τὴν δ' ἐγὼνταμειβόμην (cf. *B*, 6; Ebert-Luppe, 232 n. 15). The ν after ἐγώ is dubious, perhaps it was cancelled, though I cannot think of a reason. It looks as if the α was cancelled and an η written over it. Diplomatically, I would transcribe .η.δε̣..[.]τ̣[α̣ with η above]μειβομ[.

8-21 I assume that this is one speech (cf. ad 16) and that its end coincides with the end of the poem (cf. ad 22-39; there are some parallels for this in choral lyric, cf. Führer, 61f.). The interpretation of the speech presents grave difficulties, not all of which can be blamed on the fact that but for a few uninformative letters and an introducing formula all that preceded has been lost.

There are two distinct parts: 8-16 (the I defends himself against a false impression that his female interlocutor had formed of him, based perhaps

on false rumours, cf. 8 φάτιν) and 17-21 (the woman is exhorted to rule a city she has conquered). The first part is logical enough (cf. ad 9); the second part is puzzling, as is its relation to the first.

Conquering and ruling a city is "not a proper pastime for a woman" (Burnett, 71; before the publication of the Cologne papyrus and my re-examination of this one, it was possible to suppose that the addressee is in fact a man; γύναι was explained, e.g. by Page, PCPS 7, 1961, 69, with a reference to A. *Ag.* 1625, where Aegisthus is so addressed).

Adrados came to help with a metaphorical explanation: the city is in fact the speaker's body, and the ruling is erotical (the only parallel is Theogn. 951 = 1278c, and it is far from certain; the θριγκός and πύλαι of *B*, 14 cannot serve as a support). This hypothesis was adopted by West (1974, 119f.) and defended with considerable vigour by Burnett (who unfortunately based her interpretation on the supplement εὐφρόνηι in 9, which is an unlikely one at best). Yet as West admits, such details as εἶλες αἰχμῆι and μέγ' ἐξήραο κλέος do not suggest this metaphor (and unlike West, I cannot believe that in Archilochus "εἶλες αἰχμῆ etc. might be used without meaning more than εἶλες"). The further suggestion that the woman is Neobule is rightly rejected by Kamerbeek (11) on the ground that Archilochus would not have addressed her, before they broke up, as γύναι.

I think we have no option but to accept the lines at face value. The woman is apparently a seventh-century Artemisia (brought up by Peek, 200; Kamerbeek compares Polycrite, who had helped conquer a fortress and saved Naxos, cf. Polyaen. VIII 36; Parth. 9; Plu. 254b-f), who has seized a city that no men (if οὔ] ̣τοι is rightly read in 18) had ever sacked before; maybe she is unwilling to rule it because she is a woman and afraid of criticism (so Treu); if so, the I promises the help he states he can give to his friends—this appears to be the main point of 8-16; if λόγων νῦν τῶνδ' ἀληθείη πάρα is correct, these words are best taken to imply that he will indeed help her. It is along these lines that a connection between the two parts of the speech can be made: the exhortation of 20f. is to be viewed in the light of 14.

There is no good reason to assume that the I is not Archilochus, who was, after all, a soldier, and who may have helped in the conquest. But it is fruitless to speculate beyond this.

8 γύναι: Not necessarily 'ehrerbietige Apostrophe fürstlicher Frauen' (Peek): at Theogn. 1213 it is used to address a slave.

φάτιν: The word seems to be normal Ionic (it occurs only once in epic as against eight times in Hdt.); on account of its suffix it is usually regarded as an old poetic word. The word is often qualified with genitives like ἀνθρώπων (Pi. *P.* 3,112), ἀνδρῶν ἠδὲ γυναικῶν (φ 323; cf. S. *Ant.* 123;

Pi. *O.* 1,28; Hdt. II 102,3), not elsewhere with πρὸς ἀνθρώπων (but cf. Sol. fr. 2,3 φάτις...μετ' ἀνθρώποισι γένοιτο). The papyrus' variant πρὸς ἀνθρώπους is inferior. Note τὴν μέν, words that are neither of them used lightly by Archilochus: two φάτεις appear to be contrasted (in prose τὴν μὲν πρὸς ἀνθρώπων κακὴν φάτιν). On account of the parallels adduced, it is not necessary to supply κακῶν in order to provide ἀνθρώπων with an adjective, while S. *Ai.* 187 κακὰν...'Αργείων φάτιν (cf. 192; 826) decidedly favours κακήν.

9 μὴ...μηδέν: This reinforcement of the prohibitive negative is not elsewhere found in archaic epic or lyric.

τετραμαίνω: Derived from τέτραμος (cf. θυμαίνω: θυμός). In τετρεμαίνω (Attic according to Moeris 319 Pierson and found twice in Aristophanes, *Nub.* 294 and 374, both times with τετραμ- as a variant), the vocalism of τρέμω is restored. The word is not elsewhere found outside comedy and medical authors.

9f. ἀμφὶ δ' εὐφ[| ἐμοὶ μελήσει: μέλει μοι is not elsewhere connected with ἀμφί and West (1974, 119) gives good reasons to take the ἀμφί phrase as an introducing colon ("as for..., I will take care of that"), showing that all three cases (*Hy.Herm.* 172 gen.; H 408 dat.; *Hy.Dem.* 85 acc.) may follow. But since μέλει μοι περί τινος is quite common (from A. *Cho.* 780 onwards), this is perhaps not absolutely necessary.

εὐφ[: There can be little doubt that a form of εὔφρων ('kindly disposed') is to be supplied; this is the only supplement that explains τὴν μέν in 8 and yields a coherent thought at least up to 16 ("Don't be afraid of bad talk and I will take care of (the talk of) our friends. If you think I am incapable of that you have formed a wrong opinion of me: I know perfectly well how to deal with my friends and my enemies"). εὔφρων as a synonym of εὐμενής is neglected by LSJ, but cf. Fraenkel ad A. *Ag.* 806 (to his examples add Pi. *O.* 7,63, while *Pae.* 6,115 is dubious). Apart from *Ag. l.c.* (where the text is uncertain), the adjective is not used of human beings in this meaning, and mainly on the strength of A. *Suppl.* 534 εὔφρον' αἶνον I prefer εὔφρονος (or another case in the singular) to εὐφρόνων. West's εὐφρόνηι is inspired by his hypothesis that the narrator has propositioned to the woman; even if this is true (cf. ad 8-21), the word is inept, and Burnett's interpretation (72 n. 55) as 'pleasure or well-being' is no improvement.

10 θυμὸν ἵλ.ον τιθεῦ: Cf. I 639 ἵλαον ἔνθεο θυμόν; T 178; *IG* V 1, 1562,2. ἵλαος is found Archil. fr. 94,2; 108,2. Latte (493 n. 2) wants to write ἵλεος as this is the normal Ionic form (it would be more precise to say that this is the form exhibited by the best MSS. at the two places where it is found in Hdt.); ἵλαος, he claims, is an epicism justified at the other two places in Archil., where it is said of gods, but not here. But

the Ionic development -εως ⟩ -εος is not positively attested for iambus or elegy (cf. West 1974, 79); besides, what little trace of ink there is after λ makes me think more of α than ε, though both are possible. The meaning 'cheerful' has been postulated here; *Hy.Dem.* 204; Pl. *Smp.* 206d; *Lg.* 649a (cf. ἱλαρός), but at most places 'relaxed' is better (as also *Phd.* 117b). Cf. Peek (200) "beruhige dich".

τὶθεῦ: For the spelling, cf. ad *B*, 6; the circumflex (contrast A. *Eum.* 226 τίθου) reflects the Ionic tendency to treat athematic presents as contract verbs (cf. τιθεῖ, τιθεῖσι); as the second person singular middle imperative of verbs in -έομαι ends in -έο in Ionic, the correction τίθεο is probably wrong, while τιθέο amounts to the same thing as τιθεῦ.

11f. ἐς τοῦτο...τῆς ἀνολβίης...ἥκειν: In the oldest occurrences of this well-known expression, ἥκειν is still "to have arrived", cf. Hdt. VII 38,3 ἐμὲ ἐς τόδε ἡλικίης ἥκοντα; A. *Cho.* 891 ἐνταῦθα...τοῦδ' ἀφικόμην κακοῦ—it is therefore not correct to translate "so elend wär' ich ... geworden" (Treu). Cf. Theogn. 819 ἐς ... κακὸν ἥκομεν.

11 ε̣σ, ι over ε̣: This is probably a trivialization of ἐς to εἰς (cf. 21 ἔσεαι with ηι written over it). Steffen (23) interprets as εἰ (ἐ)ς, printing a comma after ἥκειν. The resulting sentence is unobjectionable, but if this is what the scribe (or corrector) intended he made a bad job of it (cf. fr. 89,29, where τωις probably stands for τῶ(ι) (ἐ)ς, but that is in an inscription).

ἀνολβείης: Since Ionic restricts the termination -είη to nouns derived from adjectives in -ης (ἀληθείη), Chantraine's correction (ap. Lasserre-Bonnard) is probably correct. It is certainly wrong to change the spelling to -είη in Hes. *Op.* 319 (Lobel), where ἀνολβίη has a perfectly normal epic long iota. ἄνολβος is a person to whom a κακόν (of whichever nature) happens (cf. δειλός below), as can be seen from Theogn. 167 ἄλλ' ἄλλωι κακόν ἐστι, τὸ δ' ἀτρεκὲς ὄλβιος οὐδείς; hence the word is used of poverty (Hes., *l.c.*) or of unability to remain true to one's friends, as here (cf. Theogn. 288, where ἄνολβος is used of unability to cope with ψόγος).

δοκέω: The verb is used to mark a strong contrast of appearance with reality (εἰμ', 13), as Sol. fr. 13,39 δειλὸς ἐὼν ἀγαθὸς δοκεῖ ἔμμεναι ἀνήρ (cf. also Semon. fr. 7,97f.; Theogn. 162; 1381-84). φαίνομαι (cf. next line) seems to be more neutral in this respect.

12 ἀνήρ...δειλός: The adjective is wholly synonymous to κακός, cf. Theogn. 101f. κακὸν ἄνδρα...δειλὸς ἀνήρ; 57f. οἱ δὲ πρὶν ἐσθλοὶ νῦν δειλοί; 105-109; 161-163; Solon quoted above; Hes. *Op.* 214; fr. 273,2.

ἐφαινόμην: Of an appearance which may or may not conform to reality, cf. fr. 172,4 ἀστοῖσι φαίνεαι γέλως; Theogn. 455 πολλοῖς ἂν ζηλωτὸς ἐφαίνεο cf. below, 21 πολλοῖσι ... ζηλωτὸς ...ἔσεαι.

13 ἐγώ...οἵων ἄπο: Cf. Simon. fr. el. 11,3 W. αὐτός - πατέρες. P. Maas's οἷ⟨σθ'⟩ ὅς (Acme 8, 1955, 113 n. 1 = *Kleine Schriften*, München 1973, 6 n. 1) is superfluous and spoils the effect of οἷος... οἵων.

ἐγωὐτὸς: There is no space for either omikron or α after ω (so rightly Peek). The crasis must be = ἐγὼ αὐτὸς, not ἐγὼ οὗτος, because in Greek one says οὗτος σύ but ἐγὼ ὅδε (π 205; φ 207 etc.; at Pi. *O.* 4,24 οὗτος is predicate).

οὐδ' οἴων ἄπο: It is a sign of low descent to let one's friends down, cf. Theogn. 529f. οὐδέ ἕνα προύδωκα φίλον καὶ πιστὸν ἑταῖρον, οὐδ' ἐν ἐμῆι ψυχῆι δούλιον οὐδὲν ἔνι. In fact, Critias reports that Archilochus (if he is the I of this poem) had a slave for his mother (fr. 44 = Archil. fr. 295), but the statement may repose on a misunderstanding (cf. *Studi* I 14 and n. 220).

ἄπο: For the preposition placed after its noun (it is wrong to use the term 'anastrophe', which denotes a change in accent, for this phenomenon), cf. below 22; 34 (but fr. 27,8 ὕπο is probably ὕπεστι because of the rule that anastrophe is not found if one or more words come between noun and preposition).

14f. Since the narrator had told the woman not to bother with bad talk and promised to deal himself with what benevolent people would say (8-10), the emphasis is clearly on τὸν φιλεῦντα μὲν φιλεῖν, line 15 being added for the sake of polarity (cf. ad 16 μύρμηξ). The sentiment expressed in these lines is a commonplace of Greek popular morality (Socrates seems to have been the first to oppose it); I give a selection from lyric poetry: Archil. fr. 126; Solon fr. 13,5; Theogn. 337f.; 871f.; (547f. is wrongly explained by H. Fränkel, 475); Sapph. fr. 5,6f.; Pi. *P.* 2,83f. (cf. Bossi; Slings 1983); *I.* 3/4, 66. The lines are imitated by Phld. *Epigr.* V 1f. G.-P. = *AP* V 107; see also XII 103 (adesp.).

14 τὸν φιλ̣ε̣ῦ̣ν̣τ̣α̣ (hardly anything is left between λ and ν, but there is no real lacuna): "who treats me like a friend", contrast τὸν φίλον (any person who has a certain tie with someone: relative, associate, friend). Cf. Theogn. 871 οἵ με φιλεῦσιν; the two notions combined 336 τῶν...φίλων...οἵ με φιλεῦσιν. In archaic Greek, especially in Homer, φιλεῖν and ἐχθαίρειν are normally used to refer to friendly or inimical actions rather than feelings (mostly in the aorist), cf. Γ 415; Hes. fr. 25, 30-32 = 229, 10-12. For the whole phrase, cf. Hes. *Op.* 353 τὸν φιλέοντα φιλεῖν.

15 A horizontal stroke above the line (between]ν̣ and ε) is probably the base of δ (added afterwards as in 13). The scribe must have written εχθραιρειν (diplomatically: εχθ·α̣·ρ̣ειν̣).

κὰκο[: Because of the grave accent, κακοστομέειν and similar suggestions are ruled out; κακώμεναι presents an epic termination that is out of the question in iambus; κακοῖς δακεῖν (cf. Phld., *l.c.*; E. *Med.* 110) is not unattractive, but there is no parallel for the endings -οις/-ηις in trimeters (and one would expect the present infinitive). Cf. Slings 1983. For my own conjecture κακοῦν ἅτε, cf. Slings 1982 (I should have discussed Gallavotti's examples of comparative appositions, 155: Herod. 6,14 κύων

ὑλακτέω; Theogn. 347 ἐγὼ δὲ κύων ἐπέρησα χαράδρην etc.; many others may be found in Groeneboom and Headlam-Knox ad Herod., *l.c.* But in such cases there usually is a semantic relationship between apposition and predicate, in other words, the predicate is part of the comparison, which it is not at our place).

16 μύ]ρμηξ: The supplement is certain enough, but its interpretation very much disputed: 1. Proper name, vocative (Peek, Adrados (ed.), Schiassi, Steffen, Giordano, Mette, Lendle in *Politeia und Res publica*, Wiesbaden 1969, 47); the previous conversation with a woman now appears to be told to a man, the end of the narrator's answer coinciding with the end of the narrative. For the absence of a concluding formula, one may compare the end of *Hy.Ap.*: 526-530 speech of the Cretans' leader, 531 introductory line to 532-544, speech of Apollo to the Cretans, directly followed by 545f., the poet's own address to Apollo; cf. *Hy.Dion.* 55-60; Sapph. fr. 1,25; Telesilla (?) 935, 19-26 *PMG*; B. 5, 176; Führer, 57-60 (B. 3,85 is not the end of a narrative passus). But in none of the examples is it the I whose speech rounds off a narrative and in all of them the narrator goes on to invoke a god. These facts strongly suggest that some concluding formula is necessary and it is doubtful that λόγωι...τῶιδ' or λόγων...τῶνδ' can serve as a surrogate (matters are made worse by the hypothesis that the narrator's answer to the woman ends not in 15 but in 10, so Peek).

Secondly, if it is the narrator's aim to exhort 'Myrmex' to take possession of the city he has conquered, it is not clear why his conversation with the woman had to be reported so extensively, as it does not seem to be very relevant in this situation ("I once told a woman that I was quite capable of helping my friends, so now you go ahead and rule this city, sc. because I am capable of helping you"). Nor are things made any clearer by the supposition that 19f. refer not to a city but to Myrmex' wife or concubine, the woman addressed in 8-15 ("Domina tua, mihi crede, eadem est quam reliquisti eademque erga te sentit... Proinde fac ut in domo tua sis rex ac vir beatus multisque invidendus", Schiassi, 159): why, if the emphasis is on the woman's attitude, is the narrator's answer reported at all, and why does it stress his own, not her, ἀρετή?

2. Subject (or other constituent) of a verb to be supplied in 16. This invariably leads to interpretations that are fanciful at best: "möge eher eine Ameise diesem Worte den Weg verstopfen (nämlich ehe ich dich verrate)" (Latte, reading λόγω[ι and βυσ]θείη πάρ[ος; his alternative suggestion μύ]ρμηξ λόγω[ι σ]ὺν τ[ῶιδε κρυφ]θείη πάρ[ος is left untranslated and unexplained); "I am an ant of words" (Adrados 1956, μύ]ρμηξ λόγω[ν ο]ὖν [εἰμ'· impossible for various reasons and rightly retracted in his edition); "possa una formica credere prima a queste mie parole (se non è

vero quanto ti dico)'' (Giannini, 62; μύ]ρμηξ λόγω[ι ν]υν τ[ῶιδε πεισ]θείη πάρ[ος); ''like an ant, I proceed with judgment along the straight road'' (Gallavotti; his supplement μύ]ρμηξ λόγωι νυν τ[είνομ(αι) ἰ]θείῃ πάρ[α requires *scriptio plena* to account for the space and νυν stands in the wrong place, as also in Giannini's proposal).

3. I do not quite understand the syntactical interpretation that lies at the background of Treu's ''so heisst es von der Ameise'', or of Lasserre-Bonnard's ''La fourmi mord''; a one-word sentence (cf. Theoc. 15,40 Μορμώ—or ἵππος) is certainly out of place. Nor do I believe that the speaker can be addressing himself (Rankin, 4 n. 6).

4. ''I, the boxing thong'', so M. Poliakoff, *Studies in the terminology of the Greek combat sports*, Königstein/Ts. 1982, 59f., cf. Poll. III 150; Hsch. ι 612; μ 1902 Latte; *AP* XI 78,3 (Lucillius); II 226 (Christodorus; see Poliakoff, 54-56 for other instances). But this use of μύρμηξ is not found before the first century AD; it puts the emphasis exclusively on line 15, whereas it should be mainly on 14; in the other literary instances the context makes it clear that μύρμηξ is not to be taken literally (Christodorus) or there is a pun (Lucillius)—here, one certainly expects a signal that not the insect but the boxing device is meant.

5. ''Like an ant'', belonging to the preceding sentence. Lobel explains this with a reference to the proverb ἔνεστι κἀν μύρμηκι κἀν σέρφωι χολή (Schol. Ar. *Av.* 82; *Corp. Paroem. Gr.* I 74; 182; 239; II 111; 163; Suid. σ 256 Adler; *An.Par.* I 397; Eust. 1599,37; *AP* X 49,1 (Palladas)) but ''even an ant'' is wholly out of tune with 13. Morel quotes Theoc. 9,31 τέττιξ μὲν τέττιγι φίλος, μύρμακι δὲ μύρμαξ and D. Chr. 40,32 (the ants) οὐδέποτε ἠνώχλησαν ἀλλήλους, ἀλλὰ πάνυ πράως ἐντυγχάνουσι καὶ παρίασι καὶ βοηθοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις; this accounts for 14, not for 15 (cf. Slings 1982), but as we have already seen, 14 contains the main point that the narrator is making. Perhaps some animal fable lies at the background (Treu refers to Aes. 176 Hausrath: an ant saves a dove who had saved him).

λογω. .υν (it is misleading to print λόγωι ṿυν as West does): The trace to the left of υ does not suggest ν to me; λόγωι μὲν (Peek) is out of the question. λόγων οὖν (Adrados 1956) best fits the traces (elsewhere Archil. uses ὦν, fr. 49,8; *B*,2, but λόγων ὦν τῶνδ' may have been avoided for euphonic reasons), but one does not expect connective οὖν in this period. If ἀλη]θείῃ is supplied (as I think it should), λόγωṿ ṿῦν τ[ῶνδ' is the most satisfactory reading (cf. Hdt. III 64,1 ἡ ἀληθείη τῶν τε λόγων καὶ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου; E. *Hipp.* 9 δείξω δὲ μύθων τῶνδ' ἀλήθειαν τάχα), but I remain doubtful (Peek's rejection of λόγων νῦν on grounds of space is overconfident). νῦν is preferable to νυν: ''Now is the time for these words (sc. the preceding ones, as in E. *Hipp.* *l.c.*) to come true'': cf. τάχα in Euripides. The speaker promises to help his friends right away. Note the position of νῦν between λόγων and τῶνδ'; cf. *B*, 8.

τ̣[ῶνδ' (τ virtually certain): For the median diaeresis, cf. *B* App. 2.2.1.; *Studi* I 5, n. 67.

ἀλη]θείη: The word seems to function as an abstract noun corresponding to various (near-)synonymous adjectives, cf. φ 62 μῦθος ἐτήτυμος; Stes. fr. 192,1 *PMG* ἔτυμος λόγος; Γ 204 ἔπος νημερτές; Pi. *O.* 1,28 ἀλαθὴς λόγος. With ἀλη]θείη πάρ[α, cf. Mimn. fr. 8,1 ἀληθείη δὲ παρέστω (though used in a different sense). The acute accent on πάρ[suggests πάρα (cf. 13 ἄπο̣) rather than πάρος (which was too easy for an ancient reader to recognize for it to require an accent).

17].[: The tip of a tail below the line; φ ψ ρ, possibly υ. I do not understand West's]α̣[. ἣν (or ἧς, cf. below) σ]ῦ̣ [νῦν is not unattractive in itself, but given the plausibility of ν]ῦ̣ν in 19, one may doubt if even Archilochus, fond though he is of νῦν, used it twice in what is probably the same sentence.

]πιστρ ε̣[...].: This is either ἐ]πιστρε̣[φέω]ς ('earnestly, severely', cf. Hdt. I 30,3), e.g. πό]λιν δὲ̣ τ̣αύτη[ν χρὴ] 'φ̣[έπειν ἐ]πιστρε̣[φέω]ς (cf. *E*, 11) or ἐ]πιστρέ̣[φεα]ι̣. The first possibility, which has been neglected hitherto, entails the supplement ἥν] τ̣οι in the next line (τήν] is too long); however, the content of 18f. makes it a main rather than a relative clause and one may ask whether Archilochus is to be credited with so prosaic a phenomenon as "relative Anknüpfung" (the poetic examples quoted K.-G. II 435f. are of a different nature). On the other hand, the adverb appears to yield a clearer logical link with the preceding words ("I shall now help my friends, you take care of the enemies in the city") than ἐπιστρέφεαι could. If the verb is read, one must supply either ἥν or ἧς before it; the accusative would denote the space within which a movement takes place, cf. Hes. *Th.* 953 γαῖαν ἐπιστρέφεται (day or night); Theogn. 648 id. (shamelessness); Anacr. 357, 4f. *PMG* ἐπιστρέφεαι δ' ὑψηλὰς ὀρέων κορυφάς (Dionysus)—I doubt that with a human agent and a restricted place like πόλιν it is a very apt word, but perhaps the later meaning 'to turn towards' a place (E. *Hel.* 83 etc.) can be defended (cf. ρ 486 ἐπιστρωφῶσι πόληας). With the genitive, the word would mean 'you pay attention to, you care about', cf. Theogn. 440; Anacr. fr. el. 5 W.; this is moderately satisfactory. (Other options besides the relative pronoun are unattractive if ἐπιστρέφεαι is read: both a relative at the beginning of 18 and asyndeton after 17 would make 17 a rather empty statement of fact). Whether a relative pronoun is supplied in this line or in either of the next two, it should be borne in mind that Archilochus never uses the pronoun ὁ ἡ τό in this function (fr. 176,3 and *B*, 10 are almost certainly demonstratives).

18. .]τ̣οι: As Lobel rightly remarks, this is either a qualification of ἄνδρες (the traces may fit δῆιοι, but one does not expect the word to be

scanned as two syllables, cf. fr. 58,7; 89,3; 139,5; they probably exclude ἄλλοι; θετοί does not make sense and ταγοί is probably an anachronism: given its long α, it was presumably borrowed from a Greek dialect other than Ionic or Attic, and one does not expect such a borrowing at this early date) or οὔ] τ̣οι; the latter better explains the antithesis ἄνδρες : σύ (and ποτ' : ν]ῦ̣ν).

ἐ̣ξ̣ε̣[πόρθη]σαν is a logical supplement if οὔ] is read, cf. A 19; Z 415; E. *Tro.* 95; ἐξετείχισσαν (assuming]τ̣οι to be an adjective) makes sense, but σσ is a hazardous epicism (cf. West 1974, 104f.) and if read with one σ, the word is too short.

σὺ δ̣[ὲ: As Gallavotti points out (153f.), the heavy syntactic pause so close to the end of the line is unusual in archaic poetry (there may be a parallel in fr. 112,10, where the papyrus gives a high point according to West, but the text is not understandable; it is doubtful whether the incision in Hippon. fr. 37,2 W. = 44,2 Deg. is really a heavy one); cf. fr. 91,8 ο]μνύων, ὅτε at line-end; fr. 80,5 D.[3] = Hippon. fr. 117,6 W. = 196,6 Deg.

19].νειλες: Lobel compared fr. 96,5 –⏑–]ανειλες αἰχμῆι, where it is now certain that ἣν εἷλες should be read (Peek, ZPE 59, 1985, 25). ἀνεῖλες (for reasons of space, κἀνεῖλες) is definitely to be rejected: ἀναιρέω is used for killing men, not for taking cities, for which αἱρέω is, of course, the normal word. We may therefore confidently print εἷλες. τ]ῆ̣ν is hard to reconcile with the traces (before ν, α or υ or, theoretically, a number of consonants), and cannot be taken as a relative (cf. above; it is not attractive to take it as a demonstrative, with ταύτην preceding and κείνης following). Consequently, ν]ῦ̣ν is very probably right.

After αιχμη, probably a cancelled ν as in 24; iota above the line.

κα̣[ὶ μέγ' ἐ]ξήρα[ο] κ̣[λ]έο̣ς: Cf. ω 33 μέγα κλέος ἤρα(ο); α 240; Z 446; Theogn. 867. The normal expression is κλέος (κῦδος, εὖχος) ἀρέσθαι or ἄρασθαι; ἐξάρασθαι (literally 'to earn') is probably Archilochus' innovation.

ἐξήραο̣: Elsewhere the termination is written -ω in Archilochus (fr. 172,1; 189), and this is what one expects on phonological grounds. Therefore West is probably right in ascribing the 'open' orthography to ancient grammarians (*app.cr.* ad loc.), though it cannot be entirely excluded that -αο was used on purpose to underscore the epicism. In Herodotus, -αο is normal. Cf. ad *B*, 6.

The sign to the right-hand side of the line (slightly lower than it) may be interpreted as an antisigma (preceding a note as in the Hawara *Iliad*, cf. Turner, nr. 13; there is, however, no trace of ink after it) or a περιγραφή, i.e. a bracket meant to delete (cf. Turner, p. 18 and ad nrs. 15; 25); I have no explanation for the two dots to its left. The second

possibility deserves closer investigation. One expects another bracket, facing right, to have stood somewhere to the left of the column, now lost; I see only two possible places, namely to the left of 18 (18-19 to be deleted) or of 19 (19 to be deleted). In the first case, we are invited to connect 17 πόλιν δὲ ταύτην directly with 20 κείνης ἄνασσε; this would imply ἥν after ταύτην and thus a construction of the type called inverted attraction (cf. *Hy.Dem.* 66f. κούρην τὴν ἔτεκον...τῆς ἀδινὴν ὄπ' ἄκουσα; K.-G. II 414; for the two demonstratives, cf. S. *OT* 449-451 τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον, ὃν..., οὗτός ἐστιν ἐνθάδε). But there should perhaps be another bracket to the right of 18. If only 19 has to go, we should likewise supply a relative in 17 and there can be no opposition between ἄνδρες and σὺ δὲ in 18. In either case we might suppose that an ancient scholar considered conquering cities ἀπρεπές for a woman and deleted one or two lines (19 would be sufficient). But there may have existed more positive evidence for deletion, and it is an intriguing fact that 19 and fr. 96,5] ἣν εἷλες αἰχμῆι καὶ .[are practically identical (but for the fact that 96,5 seems to be a trochaic tetrameter): maybe an iambic version of fr. 96,5 was interpolated here in some way or other in the course of the transmission of Archilochus.

It goes without saying that all this is highly uncertain and I have treated 18-19 as authentic lines. But interpreters of this poem should take into account, as they have failed to do hitherto, the existence of the sign under discussion, and it is relevant to note that line 19 plays a crucial part in most interpretations.

20 **τ̣[υραν]ν̣ίην**: The word is found Xenoph. fr. 3,2 and for τυραννίδα ἔχειν, cf. Hdt. III 53,3; S. *OT* 592; E. *Heracl.* 423; *Pho.* 506.

21 **π[ο]λ̣[λοῖ]σ̣ι̣**: The π is certain; πᾶσιν σὺ is on the short side, and πᾶσιν...ἀνθρώπων is definitely less likely than πολλοῖσι...ἀνθρώπων (cf. Theogn. 455 πολλοῖς ἂν ζηλωτὸς ἐφαίνεο τῶνδε πολιτῶν).

[.]η[. with το. s.l.: θ]η[ν leaves too much space after σ̣ι̣, π]η[ι too much before ζ]η̣λωτὸς (this goes a fortiori for δ]ὴ[]); the only supplement that accounts for the space on both sides of]η[is μὴν. However, μήν is not an Ionic word (it is a variant at Hippon. fr. 52 W. = 55 Deg.), its use after a form of πολύς is atypical (δή being the proper reinforcing particle, cf. *C*, 4), and Archilochus is not fond of emphatic μέν/μήν any more than he is of γε (it is used fr. 124b3 in the combination οὐδὲ μέν). Therefore the variant τοι̣ is to be preferred.

ζηλωτός: A female form at E. *Andr.* 5; *Med.* 1035 (both times, as here, avoiding hiatus); ζηλωτή is first found Pl. *Hp.Mi.* 368b. Nowhere else in iambus and elegy do we find non-compounded female verbal adjectives in -τός (there are some twenty in -τή, but more than half of them are from the purely formal epithets ἐρατός and ἱμερτός). Cf. B 742 κλυτὸς Ἱπ-

ποδάμεια; ε 422. On balance, linguistic evidence is slightly disfavourable to the hypothesis that the addressee is a woman. For end of speech coinciding with (presupposed) end of the poem, cf. Führer, 61f.

22-39 I consider this (with Lobel, Peek, West and others) a separate poem for the following reasons. Line 7, combined with 8 γύνα[ι], proves that at least up to 15 the addressee is a woman. In 29, there is a participle which must be taken as masculine nominative, agreeing with the second person singular of 28; therefore in 28 the addressee is a man. From 17 onwards, the verb forms are predominantly second person singular.

There are now two possibilities. Either the speech beginning at line 8 ends at 15; from 16 onwards there is a male addressee (this causes some trouble in 16, but gives the most natural interpretation to 21); we must then assume that 8-15 is the end of a conversation reported to the addressee. Or there is no end of a speech at 15 and a new poem, with a male addressee, starts somewhere before 28. Since the beginning of a new poem should be marked by (at least) a paragraphos, which there is not between 20 and 21 (where the papyrus would have shown it) and which there cannot have been between 17 and 20 (because the content of these lines is coherent), such a new poem would start in 22 (hardly later, because the content is coherent again). Of course, the absence of a title, like the one probably contained in 40, is no argument.

Even if the difficulties raised in my note at 16 are disregarded, the first hypothesis can hardly stand. A male addressee has seized a town and is exhorted to rule it; next we are told that this person has just arrived from a sea voyage, with or without a cargo, and the crossing appears to have been very perilous; the narrator has been worried to death and is now greatly relieved—end of poem. No matter how much we blame the lacunary state of the papyrus, this is not a consistent whole. To complicate matters, the addressee is given a full account of a conversation which the narrator had with a woman, the upshot of which appears to be that the narrator has shown that he is a reliable friend; one would expect this point to return after the description of the voyage, but there cannot be a greater contrast than the one between the self-confident tone of 11-15 and the strong metaphor of helplessness in 38 f.

On the other hand, 22-39 makes excellent sense as a self-contained poem. It is a prosphonetikon, a poem written to welcome a friend who has returned from a journey. One may compare Sapph. fr. 48; Alc. fr. 350; Theogn. 511-522; Ar. *Av.* 676-684; Theoc. 12; *AP* V 235 (Maced.; a clever variation); Catull. 9; Horat. *Carm.* I 36; II 7; III 14; Juven. 12. F. Cairns (*Generic composition in Greek and Latin poetry*, Edinburgh 1972, 21f.) gives a list of topoi commonly used in this genre; the following are

relevant to this poem (which is not mentioned by him): 1. An announcement of the arrival (23); 2. The place where the traveler has been (23); 3. Expressions of affection of the welcomer (25); 4. Demonstrations of affection (28?); 5. Divine assistance to the traveler (36); 6. Safety of arrival (indirectly, 29f. and 33-35); 7. Joy of welcomer (38f.). The first two topoi, if they are at all present, are invariably found at the beginning of a poem, at least in Greek literature.

It must be stressed that there are no external data for postulating a new start at 22. Mette thought that there is a rest of a coronis to the left of 21; in fact this is the letter π (the fibres are bent to the left). Peek points out that the interlinear space between 21 and 22 is wider than normal (197); this is true, but the same holds for those between 32 and 33 and between 36 and 37.

Also, the hypothesis of a separate poem does not contribute much to solving the problems of interpretation of 1-21. It is true that 21 is a fine concluding line, but the female warrior and ruler of 17-20 and the surprising ζηλωτός of 21 remain. However, I am prepared to accept these difficulties, rather than going along with the fantastic reconstructions of 1-39 that have been given (there is a doxography in Treu, 178-181, and a further attempt, 181-185; add Adrados 1956; Giannini; Rankin).

22 (1) If a new poem begins here, the vocative of a proper name is certainly called for.

νηῒ σὺν σ̣[μ]ι̣κρῇ: For the postposition, cf. ad 13. σὺν νηΐ appears to be an epicism (A 183 etc.; in later poetry Alc. fr. 208a4; Solon fr. 19,3; adesp. mel. 925e5 *PMG*; Theoc. 11,61—not in tragedy).

σμικρῇ μέγαν: Cf. γ 296 μικρὸς δὲ λίθος μέγα κῦμ' ἀποέργει; (σ)μικρός is otherwise very rare in epic. Archilochus may be alluding to this passage, which describes the shipwreck of Menelaus' fleet near the Gortyn area (if so, μικρός, for which Zenodotus read Μαλέου, is a very old reading). For the antithesis, cf. fr. 114,1-3; Theogn. 14; A. *Cho.* 204; 262; for the juxtaposition, S. *OC* 149; E. *Andr.* 352.

σ̣[μ]ι̣κρῇ: Lobel rightly observes that μ̣[ε]ι̣κρῇ fits the traces equally well (cf. 11 ἀνολβείης for ἀνολβίης). At fr. 114,3 the sources are divided between μικρός and σμικρός (the word is not found elsewhere in iambus; in elegy both forms are attested). As σμικρός is the normal form in Ionic (though LSJ s.v. μικρός sorely exaggerates its preponderance), I have decided to adopt it.

23 (2) πόντον περή]σ̣ας is a felicitous supplement, even if rather short, cf. ι 129 νηυσὶν περόωσι θάλασσαν; ζ 272; ω 118 περήσαμεν...πόντον; Pi. *P.* 3,76; *N.* 3,21. For μέγαν πόντον, cf. S 286,12 *SLG* ὁ μέ[γα]ς πόντος (opening words of a melic poem); Alex. Ephes. 38 *Suppl. Hell.*; πέλαγος μέγα Ξ 16; γ 179 etc. εὐρύς and βαθύς are more normal epithets (μέγαν was

called for because of the antithesis). For μέγαν | [φόρτον κομίσ]ας one should compare Hesiod's advice (*Op.* 643) νῆ' ὀλίγην αἰνεῖν, μεγάλῃ δ' ἐνὶ φόρτια θέσθαι; for -σσ- cf. ad 18.

ἦλθες: In related poems of a later date, this tends to be the incipit, cf. Sapph. fr. 48,1; Alc. fr. 350,1; Theogn. 511 ἦλθες δὴ Κλεάριστε βαθὺν διὰ πόντον ἀνύσσας; Ar. *Av.* 676; Theoc. 12,1. The example is π 23 = ρ 41 ἦλθες Τηλέμαχε, γλυκερὸν φάος. In some of these cases, the sentence may be a question (so certainly Cat. 9,3 uenistine domum cet.), but hardly here.

Γορτυνίης: The area around Gortyn (the city itself was situated 90 stades from the coast, Scyl. 47; Str. X 4,7), called Γορτυνία also by Str., *l.c.*, so that the supplement χώρ]ας is unnecessary (apart from its introducing an unwarranted Atticism). The gulf of Messara was one of the riskiest parts of the seas sailed by the Greeks (apart from Menelaus' shipwreck mentioned above, the apostle Paul got into trouble there as well): ἐκ Γορτυνίης is more than a prosaic detail. Cf. Alc., *l.c.*, ἦλθες ἐκ περάτων γᾶς. Above (Γορ)τυνίης, traces of ink that are plausibly a gloss on this word, but attempts to read it have not resulted in anything tangible (χος Peek; "-κης e -κις fortasse correctum" Lasserre-Bonnard; ...α..χος West); unlike Lobel, I am certain that the traces are letters, but nothing can be verified.

24 (3) 'Before ο what most resembles the upper part of a rather broad χ followed by a headless ρ' Lobel. I would rather think the omikron is preceded by either η or ει (with perhaps an apostrophos above the line) and the trace of a σ before that. I agree with Lobel that the letters after omikron are best interpreted as ττιτ (perhaps the second τ is cancelled); τητ (West) is far less likely and τριτ (Gallavotti) almost certainly excluded. After the third τ (if it is one), traces that fit in with a circular letter, then π (Lobel) rather than γ (West). Between this last letter and εσταθη⟦ν⟧ I think there are two letters, not one (Lobel, West), but παρεστάθη is excluded; the first of these two letters may just possibly be an ε. With a great deal of hesitation, I submit ἐπ{εσ}εστάθη (if the first of the two groups εσ was cancelled, this would not be visible); ἐπεστάθη makes good sense in this context ("something good has happened to me"; cf. *B*, 21). ὅτι τ' ἐπεστάθη would then be a natural guess, but if my analysis of the letters before omikron is right, this would create a dactyl in the fourth foot (the resolution in itself would be less of a problem, cf. 36 (15), where it is possible to scan θεός as disyllabic, *pace* West 1974, 83; ὅτι τ' would probably constitute a prosodic unit with ἐπεστάθη).

εστάθη⟦ν⟧: A useful iambic variant of ἔστη; cf. 28; 39; fr. 67,9; 82,6; 94,2; 128,3; 153,7.

25 (4) ἁρπαλ[ί]ζομ[αι: Cf. Hsch. α 7399 Latte ἁρπαλίζομαι· ἀσμένως

δέχομαι. The middle is not elsewhere attested, but ἀρπαλίζομεν is definitely out of key. The word is first found here (cf. ἀρπαλέως) and recurs in Aeschylus; it has a poetic but un-epic flavour (and rhythm).

26 (5) A vertical shaft to the left of γυ; κρηγύης seems to be the only possibility, but it should be borne in mind that the word appears to mean 'aboding good' in this period (A 106; Hp. *Coac.* 31); only later does it become a synonym of χρηστός (Ps.-Pl. *Alc. I* 111e). Therefore ἐπὶ νηὸς κρηγύης does not impose itself; I should rather think of "you arrived with a good omen", or "under favourable conditions".

27 (6) West's supplement ἐξηρτυμένης is based on a misunderstanding created by Lasserre, who compared fr. 122,12 ἠρ]τύθη γάμωι̣ (if this latter supplement is correct, its subject should be ἕδνα, cf. α 277 etc. ἀρτυνέουσιν ἔεδνα) and thus arrived at γα̣μοῖσιν ἐξηρτυμένοις (but -οις is unlikely in trimeters, cf. ad 15, and the constructions are entirely different). Before μοι, λ or α; after ε, ξ or ζ;].ς: lower tip of an upright. If ὀφθα]λ̣μοῖσιν is read something along the lines of ἰδὼν δέ σ' ὀφθ. seems the best guess, because χεῖρα καὶ π[αρ]εστ[ά]θη. in the next line suggests the encounter of the I with his merchant friend.

28 (7) χεῖρα: Perhaps object of some form of προτείνω, cf. fr. 296 προτείνω χεῖρα. προύτεινες αὖτε?

π[αρ]εστ̣[ά]θη.: Both -ην and -ης possible; the latter perhaps to be preferred for poetical reasons. In West's reconstruction θεὸς δὲ προέσχε χεῖρα καὶ παρεστάθης, the second verb is a repetition of ἀφίκ[εο two lines above, and the first part recurs in 36. π[ρο] instead of π[αρ] is a theoretical possibility only.

29 (8)].ο̣υσας: It is hard to think of a feminine noun to which this can be an attributive participle and it is practically out of the question that such a phrase could be construed with the preceding verb. Therefore this is a masculine aorist participle of a verb ending in -ούω; as]σ̣ασ ἦλθες in 23 can refer to a male or female addressee, this line provides the only good evidence that the latter is excluded, and that a change of addressee has taken place between 15 and 22.

φ[ο]ρτίων δέ μοι μέ[λ]ε̣ι̣: μέλει is impersonal here, and probably at 10; fr. 215; with a personal subject fr. 19,1; 177,4 (fr. 5,3; 28,7; 82,8 are uncertain). There is little doubt that the next line should contain a negative (οὐδέν or οὐ πάμπαν; ἥκιστα is not used as an emphatic negative in this period).

30 (9) εἴτ' ἀπώλετο: Sc. φορτία. One expects something like εἴτ' ὧν ἐσώθη to go with it (but I would place it in the next line, unless one reads φορτίων δέ μοι μέλει, εἴτ' ὧν ἐσώθη νηός, εἴτ' ἀπώλετο, οὐδέν).

31 (10) After]νε̣, a corrected letter, probably τ with σ written through it or alternatively σ with τ appended afterwards (Peek); ⟦ο⟧ (Lasserre) is

less likely, as this would imply a vertical cancellation stroke over the letter instead of an oblique one through it. Next, α̣ likely, but iota not excluded;]ν ἐστι (or ἔ]νεστι) plausible. μηχανή refers either to a possibility to recover the cargo (perhaps too trivial) or to finding another companion (cf. next line, but I see no possibility of construing it).

32 (11) At first sight, εὑ̣ρ̣οίμην would suggest μηχανήν as object, as εὑρίσκομαι is usually 'to find a solution, to think of something' (e.g. Π 472 εὕρετο τέκμωρ), but the run of 33-35 points to 'another friend'; cf. Hes. fr. 235,2f. νύμφην εὑρόμενος. Both τοῖον δ' ἂν ἄλ]λο̣ν̣ (with ἑταῖρον in 33) and φίλον δ' ἂν ἄλ]λο̣ν̣ are satisfactory (the former slightly more so, since ἑταῖρος is a more specific term than φίλος) but ν̣ is not the most likely letter (]λ.ς Lobel). Perhaps we can dispense with ἄλλον and read]λω̣ς (but ἁπλῶς is not clear to me; surely it cannot mean 'in a simple way, easily'), e.g. οὔλως ('no ... at all', cf. Theogn. 73 if ὅλως is correct there; neither ὅλος nor οὖλος is found elsewhere in iambus or elegy, but the latter form is normal in epic). Other objects are unlikely: χαράν (this should be χαρήν, but the word is not found in Ionic) or χάριν εὑρίσκομαι are strange phrases at best. It should be noted that εὑ̣ρ̣οίμην is not a certain reading; ἐχ̣θ̣οίμην is possible (but it does not seem to make sense).

33 (12) As σ]ε̣ is virtually certain as object, we have to do with a counterfactual condition, the preceding line containing the main clause. For the moods, cf. α 236-238 οὔ κε ... ἀκαχοίμην, εἰ μετὰ οἷς ἑταροῖσι δάμη Τρώων ἐνὶ δήμωι ἠὲ φίλων ἐν χερσίν, ἐπεὶ πόλεμον τολύπευσεν; K.-G. II 471f. (post-Homeric examples are scarce).

κῦμ' ἁλὸς κατέκλυσεν: Contrast fr. 13,3f. τοίους γὰρ κατὰ κῦμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης ἔκλυσεν. The differences between these places illustrate the diction of the genres to which each of them belongs: tmesis vs. normal compound; wholesale incorporation of a Homeric formula (Β 209 etc. κῦμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης) vs. variation resulting in a phrase that is not typically epic (with κῦμ' ἁλός, cf. Ζ 136 ἁλὸς κατὰ κῦμα; μ 68 κύμαθ' ἁλός; χ 387. Far more normal is κῦμα θαλάσσης. Later Alc. fr. 117b7 κῦμ' ἄλος; Stes. S 8,1 *SLG*; B 5,25f.; Pi. *Pae.* 6,100). But in either place we find the epic singular κῦμα and the unepic use of κατακλύζω (the only parallel is *Hy.Ap.* 74f. ἐμὲ μὲν μέγα κῦμα ... κλύσσει, where ἐμέ is not a person but the island Delos; even later, κατακλύζω is not normally used of persons, except metaphorically; 'overwhelm'). Of course, metrical conditions play an important part (κῦμα θαλάσσης does not enter into iambic verse), but the result is two separate genres with separate, if related, poetic idioms.

34 (13)].ν: ον or ων. As αἰχμητής is nearly always an apposition (though not in fr. 91,5), ἀνδρ]ω̣̃ν seems a good guess. Cf. Ρ 740 ἀνδρῶν αἰχμητάων; Γ 49; Hes. fr. 196,1; Tyrt. fr. 19,13; Theogn. 868; Pi. *O.*

6,86. For the word-order, cf. *C*, 3 ἀφ' ἱμερτοῦ δὲ θορὼν γλυκὺς ἵμερος προσώπου; fr. 6 ξείνια δυσμενέσιν λυγρὰ χαριζόμενοι. At the beginning of the line, ἤ seems certain, and an adverb ('perhaps', or 'wretchedly') is likely to follow (or something like γῆς ἐπ'?).

χερσὶν ... ὑπό: A typically epic expression, found only once elsewhere in lyric (Pi. fr. 35). It is especially normal with δάμνημι (e.g. B 860 = 874 ἐδάμη ὑπὸ χερσὶ ποδώκεος Αἰακίδαο), but I see no satisfactory place for δαμείς in this line or the next, and the word seems rather otiose, given ἥβην ἀγλαὴν ἀπώλεσας. Perhaps ἁλωτός ('captured') should be read in the next line (cf. B 374 χερσὶν ὑφ' ἡμετέρῃσιν ἁλοῦσα). But there is no compelling reason, apart from the absence of epic precedent, why χερσὶν ... ὑπό should not directly belong with ἀπώλεσας. I doubt if it is right to print ὕπο: there is no anastrophe if a word is placed between case-form and preposition (τῶι δ' ἐπί not τῶι δ' ἔπι); the scribe would probably have written ὑπο. But A. *Cho.* 86 most editors likewise give τῶνδε σύμβουλοι πέρι.

35 (14) ἥ]βην ἀγ̣λ̣α̣ὴν (perhaps the papyrus has αγλάην): This phrase is not found in epic but earned some popularity in lyric: Theogn. 985 ἀγλαὸς ἥβη; B. 5,154 ἀγλαὰν ἥβαν; Simon. fr. 115,1 D.³ = *AP* VII 258 ἀγλαὸν ὤλεσαν ἥβην; *IG* I² 943,1 ἀπόλεσαν ἀγλαὸν hέβεν; *Suppl. Hell.* 906,7. Cf. ἥβης ἀγλαὸν ἄνθος Tyrt. fr. 10,28; Theogn. 1007f.

ἥβην ... ἀπώλεσας: Theogn. 1069 and Mimn. fr. 2,6-10 distinguish between the loss of ἥβη and death, but ἥβην (ἀπ)όλλυμι always refers to early death: Anacr. fr. iamb. 2,2 W. = 419 *PMG*; Timoth. 791,180f. *PMG*; Simon. and *IG* as quoted above; Simon. fr. 117,3 D.³ = *AP* VII 254; A. *Pers.* 733.

"The reference to warriors need not imply that Archilochus' friend ran into a war as well as a storm. Death in battle as an alternative to loss at sea was a cliché; cf. fr. 89,19-21, *Od.* 11.398ff. Sem. 1.13ff., and with a different turn Hes. *Op.* 161-5. Mention of the relevant one leads Archilochus to bring in the other by way of complement" (West 1974, 121, aptly comparing 14f. above). But a sailor ran more risks than drowning; he could fall into the hands of pirates or barbarous tribes on stormy coasts; 34f. do not necessarily refer to death in battle. (Also, it cannot be inferred from 33 that the addressee did actually run into a storm.)

36 (15)]θ̣ε̣ῖ: This has to be a contracted spelling of a third person indicative (contrast 14 φ[ι]λ̣έει̣ν̣). ἀνθεῖ is satisfactory if ἥβη is subject, cf. ἥβης ἄνθος above and ad *B*, 18; Pi. *P.* 9,109f. Ἥβας καρπὸν ἀνθήσαντ(α); B. 3,89f. θάλειαν ... ἥβαν. ἐπαν]θεῖ is far less attractive and πάντ' seems to contradict 29f.]θες cannot be read (and νῦν μοι δ' ἀνῆλ]θες is impossible word-order). νῦν δ' is a logical supplement, ἡ μὲν suggests a contrast between the addressee's blooming youth and—exactly what? (a pronoun referring to ἥβη is indeed in order). Perhaps κείνη νυν ἀν]θεῖ.

θε[ὸς ἐ]ρ⟨ρ⟩ύσ̣α̣το: The lacuna is not wide enough for [οσερ]. It is highly doubtful that Archilochus can be credited with ἐρύσατο. Cf. Ο 289 ἀλλά τις αὖτε θεῶν ἐρρύσατο (in the preceding line χερσὶν ὑπ' Αἴαντος θανέειν); Υ 194 σὲ Ζεὺς ἐρρύσατο; A. *Th.* 93f. τίς ἄρα ῥύσεται ... θεῶν.

37 (16) ϊδ..: The *trema* indicates a new word. Of the various disyllabic forms of ἰδεῖν, the optative and infinitive are ruled out on graphical grounds; I do not quite share Lobel's mistrust of ἴδῃ̣ς (ἴδηις, ἴδηι and ἴδῃ̣ cannot be read); ἰδών̣ is just possible. Of the proposed supplements at the beginning of the line, none can be excluded graphically; μ]ή̣ [σ]ε̣ best fits the traces.

μουνωθέντα: This verb is normally used (mostly in the passive) of persons who are left alone because others (friends, relations) have gone away (Λ 470, cf. 401; A. *Suppl.* 749; E. *HF* 1388) or have died (E. *Alc.* 296; 380; *Rh.* 871); here both situations are possible, but neither fits in with the second person singular of ἴδῃ̣ς. Though graphically perhaps less likely, ἰδών̣ makes better sense: "A god has saved you, seeing (you in danger?) and me left to myself".

38 (17)f. A very strong, almost biblical, metaphor. φάος is more than 'rescue' here (so Ο 741; Φ 538; Pi. *O.* 5,14; A. *Ag.* 522 etc.; as Lobel rightly observes, 'darkness' is rarely used for 'danger') as is shown by its opposite ζόφος: with one exception (Pi. *I.* 4,18), this word always denotes either a direction (the opposite of ἕως), or the underworld, and the second interpretation is supported by κείμενος, cf. S. *OT* 972 κεῖται παρ' Ἅιδηι; *El.* 463 ἐν Ἅιδου κειμένωι and especially Theogn. 567-569 ἔνερθεν γῆς...κείσομαι...λείψω...φάος ἠελίοιο; see also LXX *To.* 5,10 ἐν τῶι σκότει κεῖμαι ὥσπερ οἱ νεκροί. With ἐν ζόφῳ...ἐς φάος, cf. further Hes. *Th.* 652f. ἐς φάος ἂψ ἀφίκεσθε...ὑπὸ ζόφου ἠερόεντος; 669; *Hy.Dem.* 337f. ἀπὸ ζόφου ἠερόεντος ἐς φάος ἐξαγάγοι; Parm. fr. 1,9f.; B. 5,61; A. *Pers.* 222; 630. So the I actually says "I was dead; now I am alive again". This is very strong language for one who has been concerned for an absent friend (far stronger than similar statements in other prosphonetika like Sapph. fr. 48,2 ὂν δ' ἔψυξας ἔμαν φρένα καιομέναν πόθωι; Theoc. 12,2 οἱ δὲ ποθεῦντες ἐν ἤματι γηράσκουσι; at best, one may compare Sapph. fr. 94,1, in a farewell situation, τεθνάκην δ' ἀδόλως θέλω; Theoc. 29,5f. τὸ γὰρ αἴμισυ τᾶς ζοΐας ἔχω ζὰ τὰν σὰν ἰδέαν, τὸ δὲ λοῖπον ἀπώλετο, cf. also 8 ἐν σκότωι; Call. fr. 400; *Epigr.* 41 = V G.-P.). Presumably there was more at stake for Archilochus (if the I is he) than the possible loss of a friend, but it is idle to speculate.

38 (17)].: Of the word-final consonants, only ν fits the traces. There is no opposition to the preceding lines (as postulated by supplements like νῦν ἠλλάγη πᾶ]ν̣) because ἐν ζόφῳ κτέ continues σε θεὸς ἐρρύσατο.

κείμενο̣ς: There is some ink (barely visible) after the omikron; the ac-

cusative does not seem to fit the context. It is very likely that a temporal adjunct (in the next line) went with the participle, to underscore its anteriority to κατεστάθην; πάρος is probably too epical (it is not found in iambus or elegy, once in Hdt., IX 2,2), and I doubt if τὸ πρῶτον can mean 'formerly'; τὸ πρίν (cf. fr. 172,3) would be excellent if it can be fitted in satisfactorily; τὸ πρόσθεν (cf. M 40; δ 688; Sol. fr. 36,7, modifying a participle, πρόσθεν δὲ δουλεύουσα) will do.

39 (18) Most editors agree on αὖτις] ἐς (cf. Sol. fr. 36,24; conjectured Archil. fr. 94,3); perhaps πάλιν (cf. Theogn. 711f. ἀλλ' ἄρα κἀκεῖθεν πάλιν ἤλυθε Σίσυφος ἥρως ἐς φάος ἠελίου); e.g. τὸ πρὶν, πάλιν νῦν]. πάλιν is often used with καθίστημι.

κατεστάθην: If my interpretation of the imagery is correct, E. *Alc.* 362 ἐς φῶς σὸν καταστῆσαι βίον is almost exactly parallel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

F. R. Adrados, "Sobre algunos papiros de Arquíloco", PP 46, 1956, 38-48 (esp. 38-41).
F. R. Adrados, *Líricos griegos; elegiacos y yambógrafos arcaicos*, I, Madrid 1981².
F. Bossi, "Appunti per un profilo di Archiloco", QS 7, 1981, 117-142.
A. Bonnard, cf. Lasserre-Bonnard.
A. P. Burnett, *Three archaic poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*, London 1983 (esp. 70-76).
C. Carey, "P. Oxy. 2310 Fr. 1 Col. i v. 9". LCM 6, 1981, 247f.
J. Ebert-W. Luppe, "Zum neuen Archilochos-Papyrus", ZPE 16, 1975, 223-233.
H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*, München 1962² (esp. 158).
R. Führer, *Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik*, München 1967.
C. Gallavotti, "I giambi di P. Oxy. 2310 attribuiti ad Archiloco", Philologus 119, 1975, 153-162.
A. Garzya, "Varia philologica XI", Filologia e critica 25, 1978 (= Studi Ardizzoni), 381-389.
A. Giannini, "Archiloco alla luce dei nuovi ritrovamenti", Acme 11, 1958, 41-96 (esp. 57-68).
D. Giordano, "P. Oxy. 2310", Aegyptus 37, 1957, 209-218.
J. C. Kamerbeek, "Archilochea", Mnemos. IV 14, 1961, 1-15 (esp. 9-15).
F. Lasserre, "Un nouveau poème d'Archiloque", MH 13, 1956, 226-235.
F. Lasserre-A. Bonnard, *Archiloque, Fragments*, Paris 1958.
K. Latte, [review of Lobel], Gnomon 27, 1955, 491-499.
E. Lobel in: E. Lobel-C. H. Roberts, *The Oxyrhynchus papyri*, xxii, London 1954.
W. Luppe, cf. Ebert-Luppe.
H. J. Mette, "Zu Archilochos Pap. Ox. 2310 fr. 1 col. 1", Hermes 88, 1960, 493f.
W. Morel, "Die Ameise bei Archilochos", ZPE 8, 1971, 143f.
W. Peek, "Die Archilochos-Gedichte von Oxyrhynchos I", Philologus 99, 1955, 193-219 (esp. 196-202).
H. D. Rankin, "Archilochus (Pap. Ox. 2310 Fr. 1, Col. 1)", Eranos 72, 1974, 1-15.
G. Schiassi, "De novo Archilocho", RFIC 35, 1957, 151-166.
S. R. Slings, "Archilochus and the ant", ZPE 45, 1982, 69f.
S. R. Slings, "Once more Archilochus and the ant", ZPE 53, 1983, 31-36.
S. R. Slings, "Studi sugli Epodi di Archiloco", to appear in: *QUCC*.

W. Steffen, "Die neuen Iambengedichte des Archilochos", Proceed. IX Int. Congr. Pap., Oslo 1958 [1961], 18-29 = *Scripta minora selecta*, I, Wrocław 1973, 49-59.
M. Treu, *Archilochos*, München 1979².
E. G. Turner, *Greek manuscripts of the ancient world*, Oxford 1971.
M. L. West, *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, I, Oxonii 1971. [West; W.]
M. L. West, *Studies in Greek elegy and iambus*, Berlin-New York 1974.

B ARCHILOCHUS

'FIRST COLOGNE EPODE'

P.Colon. inv. 7511 = *P. Köln* 58, a column of a roll that was used for mummy cartonnage, recovered by means of Fackelmann's 'Waschmaschine'. Merkelbach-West, the first editors, assigned it to the second century AD; Kramer-Hagedorn point out that the mummy probably comes from Abusir el Melek and that mummies found there belong to the age of Augustus, though they admit that the script rather suggests the second century.

The last five lines of the papyrus (36-40) belong to an epodic poem that is certainly by Archilochus ('Second Cologne Epode'), the first two lines of which were already known as his (cf. *C*). Lines 1-35 are the end of another epode; Archilochus' authorship is strongly suggested by the association with the Second Cologne Epode, metre (cf. Appendix 1.1.) and the name of Neoboule (16). The authenticity was disputed by Marzullo, Gelzer (1975 and *Poet.*), Theiler (1977 and *Poet.*) but is now generally accepted (cf. Appendix 1.2. for the metrical problem); it will not be discussed here. If West's supplement in 17 is correct, the case is closed; unfortunately, the graphical data on which it is based are ambiguous (cf. *ad loc.*).

There are numerous punctuation signs, accents, breathings, apostrophoi, some vowel-length signs and tremas. Most of the punctuation signs seem to have been added later (e.g. 5) but not all of them (cf. 19); the same is perhaps true of the accents (most circumflex accents are angular, but two of them round (14; 39—in one case (7) there is an angular as well as a round circumflex, and by analogy with the punctuation signs one might infer that the round ones are original).

Punctuation signs (points) are found above the line, at letter-top and letter-bottom height and in between; in the apparatus that follows the text I have tried to reproduce them as closely as possible, but I cannot bring myself to believe in a four-fold system—in many cases the available space between the letters will have dictated the choice.

The acute and circumflex accents are in accordance with our system (but for 7 εσθλῆσ, cf. *ad loc.*). Grave accents are written on proclitic monosyllables (2 εὶ, 3 ὲν), elided disyllabic prepositions (8 κὰτ, 11 ὲπ; contrast 38 αφ'), oxytona followed by accented words (27 and 31 τὼς, 38 γλυκὺς), on an unaccented syllable when there is another accent in the same word (3 ἣμετερου; 32 χὲρσιν, cf. *ad loc.*; probably κὰτ and ὲπ belong

in the same category), once in an ambiguous case (10 παρὲξ, cf. *ad loc.*). Word-initial iota is marked either by *trema* (1,2) or by a preceding apostrophos (3,38).

Elison is usually noted (but cf. 11, 14 etc. and κὰτ, ἐπ); there is one isolated case of *scriptio plena* (21). Note 6 εγ'ωντ'αμει[as against 26 κᾰλιτήμερα. Vowel length is also indicated in 2 ῐθύει (iota always long), 4 κᾱλη (α long in Ionic; anceps position; cf. 1 ῐ̈σον), 29 τηλ]εθᾰεσσι (formation with short α very exceptional, cf. *ad loc.*). Iota is adscript, except 12 θεω (added later), 30 ἀγκαλησ (cf. *ad loc.*).

The Ionic of the papyrus is on the whole correct; there is psilosis in 11 ἐπ' ἡσυχίης (cf. *ad loc.*) as against 26, 32, 36, 38. For 15 ποη[, cf. *ad loc.* The spelling of contracted vowels follows normal practice of the time and I have not changed it, cf. ad 6 ἐφώνεε (contrast 25 ποιεῖται), corrected to ἐφώνει (a trisyllabic form is required) by writing an iota over εε. Two other readings supra lineam may be either variants or corrections (cf. 1; 33); only in 40 does a correction appear to be marked as such by cancelling (cf. *C*, ad 5). The corrections are in a slightly cursive hand; perhaps the same hand that added most accents (cf. ad 7).

I examined the papyrus at Cologne in June 1983. Where my readings differ from Kramer-Hagedorn, I discuss them in the commentary, except when I disagree on dotted letters. Of the very numerous supplements that have been proposed, I discuss only a small selection; others will be found in the apparatus of supplements and corrections. The second epode will be treated separately.

Since this is a tristichic epode (cf. Appendix 1.2.), Page (S 478 *SLG*) and West (fr. 196A *Del.*) print three-line stanzas, thereby changing the line numbers. Theoretically, this is quite correct, but it is good editorial practice not to deviate from ancient colometry unless it is absolutely necessary. I have retained the lay-out (and numbering) of the papyrus, indicating the *pausa* between hemiepes and iambic dimeter by a blank space; the Page-West numbers are given in brackets in the text and neglected elsewhere.

1 πάμπαν ἀποσχόμενος   ῐ̈σον δὲ τολμ̣[
(3) ε(ἰ) δ' ὦν ἐπείγεαι καί σε θυμὸς ἰθύει,
]ἔστιν ἐν ἡμετέρου,   ἢ νῦν μέγ' ἱμείρ[ει   ,
4 (6)]καλὴ τέρεινα παρθένος· δοχέω δέ μιν̣ [
]εἶδος ἄμωμον ἔχειν·   τὴν δὴ σὺ ποί̣η[."
(9)]Τ̣οσαῦτ' ἐφώνεε· τὴν δ' ἐγὼνταμει̣[βόμην·
7]"Ἀ̣μφιμεδοῦς θύγατερ   ἐσθλῆς τε καὶ [
(12)]γυναικός, ἣν̣ νῦν γῆ κατ' εὐρώεσσ' ἔ[χει,
τ]έρψιές εἰσι θεῆς   πολλαὶ νέοισιν ἀνδρ̣[άσιν

]π̣αρὲξ⟦ε⟧ τὸ θεῖον χρῆμα· τῶν τι̣ς ἀρχέσε[ι.
τ]αῦτα δ' ἐπ' ἡσυχίης, εὖτ' ἂν μελανθῇ[ι
ἐ]γώ τε καὶ σὺ σὺν θεῷ βουλεύσομεν̣[.
]π̣είσομαι ὥς με κέλεαι· πολλόν μ' ε.[
θ]ρ̣ιγκοῦ δ' ἔνερθε καὶ πυλέων ὑποφ[
μ]ή τι μέγαιρε φίλη· σχήσω γὰρ ἐς π̣οη[
κ]ή̣πους. τὸ δὴ νῦν γνῶθι· Νεοβούλη[ν
ἄ]λλος ἀνὴρ ἐχέτω· αἰαῖ πέπειρα δ.[
ἄ]ν̣θος δ' ἀπερρύηκε παρθενήϊον
κ]α̣ὶ χάρις ἣ πρὶν ἐπῆν· κόρον γὰρ οὐ.[
]ης δὲ μέτρ' ἔφηνε μαινόλις γυνή.
ἐς] κόρακας ἄπεχε· μὴ τοῦτ' εφε̣.τ̣α̣.[
ὅ]π̣ως ἐγὼ γυναῖκα τ̣ο̣ιαύτην ἔχων
γεί]τοσι χάρμ' ἔσομαι· πολλὸν σὲ βουλο̣[
σὺ] μ̣ὲν γὰρ οὔτ' ἄπιστος οὔτε διπλό̣η,
ἡ δ]ὲ μάλ' ὀξυτέρη, πολλοὺς δὲ ποιεῖται̣ [
δέ]δ̣οιχ' ὅπως μὴ τυφλὰ κἀλιτήμερα
σπ]ο̣υδῆι ἐπειγόμενος τὼς ὥσπερ ἡ κ[ύων τέκ- ''
Τοσ]αῦτ' ἐφώνευν· παρθένον δ' ἐν ἄνθε[σιν
τηλ]εθάεσσι λαβὼν ἔκλινα· μαλθακῆι δ̣[έ μιν
χλαί]νηι καλύψας, αὐχέν' ἀγκάλῃσ' ἔχων̣ [
].ατ⟦ι⟧ πα̣.[.]α̣μ̣ε̣ν̣ην τὼς ὥστε νεβρ̣[
]ων τε χ̣ερσὶν ἠπίως ἐφηψάμη̣ν [
]. .ἔφαι̣ν̣ε νέον ἥβης ἐπήλ̣υσιν χρόα̣ [
]ε σῶμα καλὸν ἀμφαφώμενος
]ον ἀφῆκα μένος ξανθῆς ἐπιψαυ[

Diacritic and punctuation signs:

1 αν̂ᾶσχό ἶσον 2 ε⟦ί⟧δ'ῶν κάι ἶθύει 3 ἐνή ηνῦνμεγ 4 κᾶ νοσ· δέ 5 εἶδ ειν· πόι̣η[6 αυτ' νέε· εγ'ωντ'αμει̣[7 δοῦσ θλήσ (u.v.) 8 κοσ.ή νῦν κἀτ εσό 9 ἐρψιέσ νέοι 10 παρὲξ⟦ε⟧ θεῖ μα·τῶν 11 δ'ἐπ εὖτ 12 θεωι λέυ 13 ὦσ εαι. μ'ε[14 κοῦ εώνϋ 15]ήτιμέ λη· 16 πουσ· νῦνγνῶθι· βόυ̣ 17 τω· πεπει 18 θοσδ' (u.v.) ερρύ ήϊον 19 ρισή επῆν· 20 μαινό..σ 21 εχε· τουτοεφ 23 χαρμ' μαι. 24 όυτ'α 25 μαλ' τερη· εῖτα.[26]δ̣οιχ'ό καλιτή 27 τὼσῶσ 28]αυτ' νευν· δ'ἐν 29 θάεσ ινα· 30 χέν'αγκά 31]α̣μ̣ε̣ν̣ην τὼσώσ 32 χ̣ὲρ ηπί 33]. .εφαῖν̣ε επή 34 σῶ φώ 35 ῆκα νοσ· θῆσ

Supplements and corrections:

It should be noted that some supplements have been submitted for consideration only. As a rule, I have excluded supplements that do not tally with the traces of ink. If a supplement has been proposed by several scholars, I register, as a rule, only the earliest publication. A dash indicates that the first word of the preceding proposal is to be read. Supplements that I believe to be metrically incorrect are marked with an asterisk.

0 ⟨Νεοβούλης μὲν ὢν⟩ πάμπαν ἀποσχόμενος Marzullo.

1 τολμ[: τόλμα σῇ βίηι* Theiler τολμᾶν καί με δεῖ* Borgogno ap. Boscherini et al. – νῦν σε δεῖ* Perusino ap. Degani 1974 τολμηρῶι δοκέω Gallavotti – φρονεῖς Sisti τολμῆσαί σε δεῖ* Persino ap. Degani 1974 τολμήσαιμ' ἐγώ Van Sickle τολμήσαις πάλιν Snell ap. e.p. τολμήσας κακόν Lasserre τολμήσειας ἄν Marzullo τόλμησον e.p. – κακοῖς Kamerbeek – παθεῖν Ebert-Luppe – πάλιν Snell ap. e.p. – ποθεῖν e.p. – ποθέων Koenen *Poet.* – πόθον Marcovich ap. *Poet.* – τάχα Marzullo – τελέειν Treu – φρονεῖν Degani ap. Degani-Burzacchini τολμήσω ποθεῖν West *Del.* τόλμητόν τι σοί Marzullo.

3 ἱμείρε̣[ι e.p. – γαμεῖν Casanova – γάμου e.p. – γάμων Gallavotti – λέχεος Ebert-Luppe – πέλειν Sisti – σέθεν e.p. – σ' ἔχειν vel σέο Slings 1980 ἵμειρεν κλυεῖν Gallavotti *Hlk.* – πέλειν Sisti.

4 μιν̣ e.p.

5 ποίη[σαι Ebert-Luppe – λέχος Theiler 1977 – τεήν Barigazzi ap. Boscherini et al. – φίλην Ebert-Luppe ποίησον Slings 1980 – ποθεῖν vel φιλεῖν Slings *Studi.*

6 ἀνταμει̣[βόμην e.p.

7 post καὶ: καλῆς ποτε Ebert-Luppe μακαρτάτης West ap. e.p. μάλ' εὐγενέος* Austin ap. Merkelbach 1975 et Cataudella πεπνυμένης Merkelbach ap. e.p. περικλυτῆς Gallavotti περίφρονος Page ap. e.p. σαόφρονος Marcovich σοφωτάτης Snell ap. e.p. τερψιμβρότου Casanova φιλήνορος Theiler *Poet.* φιλόφρονος Theiler 1977.

8 νυν Gallavotti *Hlk.*; ἔ[χει e.p.

9 τ]έρψιές e.p.; ἀνδ.[: ἄνδεμα Barigazzi ἂν δοχῆι Borgogno ap. Boscherini et al. ἀνδράσιν e.p.

10 πάρεξ τε Gallavotti; τίς Barigazzi; ἀρκέσε[ι e.p.

11 τ]αῦτα e.p.; μέλαν θη[* e.p. Μελάνθη[e.p. μελανθῆ[ι e.p. – βότρυα* Burkert ap. Merkelbach 1975 – γ' ἕσπερος* Burzacchini ap. Degani 1977 – γ' εὐφρόνη* Bonanno et Burzacchini ap. Degani 1977 – γ' ἡμέρη* Van Sickle ap. Degani 1977 – γ' ὀρφναίη* Degani 1977 – γ' οὐρανός* Burzacchini ap. Degani 1977 – δ' ἕσπερος* Marzullo – δ' ἡμέρη* id. – δὴ οὐρανός* Austin ap. Merkelback 1975 – ἡ εὐφρόνη* Stoessl – μοι γένυς e.p. – μοι

κόμη Theiler *Poet.* – μοι τρύγη vel τρύγος Ebert-Luppe – νύξ, ὅμου* Page *SLG* – νύξ, φίλη* Stoessl – σοι βότρυς* Ebert-Luppe, Slings 1975 – σοι δόμος vel σ' οἰκίη* Lasserre – σοι φύσις Theiler 1977 – τοι μόρον Radt (privatim) – τοι πόλος Gallavotti μέλαν θῆις χῆρ τέρεν* vel πέπον vel φίλον Casanova μ' ἐλᾶν θῆις οἴκαδε* Ricciardelli ap. Sisti μελανθῆις αἵματι* Barigazzi – που σταφίς Sisti μελανθ' ἧμιν φάος Van Sickle *QUCC* μελανθὴς e.p.

12 ἐ]γώ e.p.

13 πείσομαι Rea ap. e.p. σπείσομαι Merkelbach ap. e.p. φείσομαι Rea ap. e.p. πείσομαι ὥς με κέλεαι; Marcovich; ε.[: ἐλᾶν ἀπ' οἰκίης* Sisti ἐλαύνει νῦν πόθος* Barigazzi ἑλόντος ἱμέρου Van Sickle *QUCC* ἐπείγεσθαι δοκεῖς Van Sickle *QUCC* ἐπέσσυται πόθος Degani ap. Degani-Burzacchini – νόος Slings (this edition) ἐπέσχες μὴ βιᾶν* vel – ὕβριος Burkert ap. Merkelbach 1975 ἐπίσχεσθαι φρονεῖς vel – δύνεαι Van Sickle *QUCC* ἐποίησας ποθεῖν Führer (privatim) ἐπορνύεις πόθον Slings (this edition) ἐποτρύνει δ' ἔρως Marcovich – μένος Merkelbach 1975 – πόθος Koenen ap. Merkelbach 1975 ἐποτρύνουσ' ἐρᾶν vel ἐρέειν Lasserre ἔρ[ως e.p. ἔχ[ει Lebek ap. *e.p.* – γὰρ σεῖ' ὅπις* Casanova – καὶ νῦν πόθος* Van Sickle 1976 – πόθος γ' ὅπως* Ebert-Luppe – πόθος φιλεῖν* Theiler 1977 – σέβας Radt (privatim) – τι δρᾶν πόθος* Theiler *Poet.* ἔχειν ἀφ' ἑρμάτων* Gallavotti ἔχεις ὑπήκοον* Kannicht ap. Merkelbach 1975 ἔχοντος ἱμέρου Marcovich ap. *Poet.* – περ πόθου Ebert-Luppe.

14 θ]ριγκοῦ e.p.; δ' ἔνερθε (e.p.) δὲ νέρθε Gallavotti σ' ἔνερθε Theiler 1977 τ' ἔνερθε Marcovich; post πυλέων: ὑπ' ὀφρύας vel – ὀφρύσιν Merkelbach ap. e.p. ὕπο* Slings 1980-82 ὑποφθάνει* Barigazzi ὑποφθάνειν* West ap. e.p. ὑποφθόνως Gallavotti ὑποφλύσαι Slings (this edition) ὕποφρ' ἄγειν* Tammaro ὑποφρύων Theiler *Poet.*

15 μ]ή e.p.; ποη[: ποῆι δασέας Medaglia ap. Sisiti πόης κενεοὺς Gallavotti – ὑγρῆς Casanova ποηνόμους Slings (this edition) ποητόκους Bossi ap. Degani-Burzacchini ποητρόφους Snell ap. e.p. ποηφόρους e.p. ποηφύτους Slings (this edition). πο⟨ι⟩η[Degani 1974.

16 κ]ήπους e.p. Νεοβούλη[ν e.p. – γὰρ ὤν Lasserre – γε νῦν Snell ap. e.p. – γε σὴν*? Slings 1980 – γέ τις Casadio – δ' ἔα Gallavotti – δ' ἐμοί vel δέ μοι Kamerbeek – δ' ἐγώ... id. – δέ τις e.p. – μὲν ὤν Lloyd-Jones ap. e.p. – φίλην Ruijgh (privatim) Νεοβούλη[ς γάμον e.p. – γάμους Van Sickle *QUCC* – λέχος Lebek ap. e.p.

17 ἄ]λλος e.p.; αἰαῖ: ἆ ἆ* West 1975; δ.[: δ' ἐστι νῦν*? Barigazzi δ' ἦν πάλαι Theiler *Poet.* δ' ὤν ἄγαν Koenen 1980 δ' ὤρορεν Gallavotti δή ἐστ' ἄγαν Ebert-Luppe δή ἐστι νῦν*? Van Sickle *CJ* δὴ λίην* Kamerbeek δὴ πάλαι Theiler 1977 δὴ πέλει Austin ap. Merkelbach 1975 δὴ πέλεν Marcovich δὶς τόση West 1977.

18 ἄ]νθος e.p.

19 κ]αὶ e.p.; οὐ.[: οὐ κατέσχε πω e.p. οὐκ ἂν ἐκφύγοι Theiler – ἐδέξατο Degani ap. Degani-Burzacchini – ἐπίσταται Ebert-Luppe – ἔσχεν πόθων Degani ap. Degani-Burzacchini – ἐφίετο Gallavotti – ἔχει λέχεος Palumbo ap. Sisti – ἔχει ποτε Borgogno ap. Boscherini et al. – ἔχει πόθου Slings 1980 – ἔχει πόθων vel ποθῶν Austin ap. Merkelbach 1975 – ἠρύκακεν Marcovich.

20]ης: ἄσης Page ap. e.p. ἄτης Snell ap. e.p. ἥβης Lebek ap. e.p. ὀργῆς Ebert-Luppe φυῆς Lloyd-Jones ap. e.p. χοῆς Gallavotti ὥρης Austin ap. Merkelbach 1975.

21 ἐς] κόρακας e.p. μὴ] κόρακ' ὥς Gallavotti; κόρακάς ⟨γ'⟩ Tammaro ap. Degani 1974 – ⟨δ'⟩ Gentili et Tammaro ap. Degani 1974 -⟨σ'⟩ Theiler et Marcovich; ἄπεχε : απέχοι Tammaro ap. Degani 1974 ἀπέχει Marzullo ibid.; post τοῦτ': ἐφεῖτ' (Marcovich) ἄναξ θεῶν* Page ap. e.p. – ἀνὴρ φίλος* e.p. ἐφεσταίη (Koenen ap. Merkelbach 1975) γ' ἐμοί Slings 1980 – κακόν Lasserre – κακῶν Führer (privatim) – ποτέ Koenen.

22 ὅ]πως Koenen et Lebek ap. e.p.; τοιαύτην e.p.

23 γεί]τοσι e.p.; πολλὸν σὲ e.p. πολλόν σε Gallavotti; βουλο[: βουλοίμην Ebert-Luppe – ἔχειν Lasserre βούλομαι e.p. – cum nomine proprio Snell ap. e.p. – γαμεῖν Ebert-Luppe – γ' ἔχειν iidem – δ' ἐρᾶν vel δ' ἔχειν Marzullo – λαβεῖν Slings 1980 – πάρος e.p. – πρὸ τοῦ West *Del.* – φιλεῖν Marzullo – φίλη e.p.

24 σὺ] μὲν Lebek et West ap. e.p.; οὔτ' ε⟨ἴ⟩ διπλόη* Theiler 1977.

25 ἡ δ]ὲ e.p.; ὀξυρεπής Theiler 1977; πολλούς τε Marcovich; δ' ἐποιεῖτ' ἀτμένους* Gallavotti δὲ ποιεῖται e.p. – – δόλους Bonanno et Van Sickle ap. Degani 1974 – – λόγους Theiler – – στρόφους Gallavotti ap. Sisti – – φίλους e.p.

26 δέ]δοιχ' e.p. δεί]δοιχ' Barigazzi.

27 σπ]ουδῆι e.p. σπεύδηι Gallavotti *Hlk.*; ἐπειγομένη Gronewald ap. e.p. ἐπειγομένης Gallavotti ἐπειγομένοις Koenen et Treu ap. Merkelbach 1975; εἰ κ[υνός τινος Gallavotti *Hlk.* ἢ κ[υνός τινος id. *MCr* ἠκ[ουσας λόγον id. *Hlk.* ἡ κ[ύων Gronewald ap. e.p. – – κυεῖ Sisti – – τέκηι Gronewald ap. e.p. – – τέκον Slings – – τέκω e.p.

28 τοσ]αῦτ' e.p. τοι]αῦτ' Gallavotti *Hlk.*; ἄνθε[σιν e.p.

29 τηλ]εθάεσσι e.p. τηλ]εθάουσι Gallavotti; post μαλθακῆι: δὲ γῆν Theiler 1977 δ' ἅμα Gallavotti δ' ἐνὶ Tammaro δ' ἐπὶ Ebert-Luppe δέ μιν e.p. δέμας Marcovich.

30 χλαί]νηι e.p. κλί]νηι Ebert-Luppe; ἀγκάλησ' Gallavotti; ἔχων e.p.

31].ατ⟦ι⟧: ἄμματι Kamerbeek ἄσθματι Burkert ap. Merkelbach 1975 et Cataudella βλήματι e.p. δείματι West ap. e.p. δέσματι Kamerbeek εὔγματι vel -τα Slings (this edition) θαῦμά τι Austin ap. Merkelbach 1975 λήματι Gallavotti ap. Sisti νεῖμά τε Barigazzi πτώματι e.p. στρώματι Theiler σφάλματι e.p. τραύματι e.p. χάρματι Gallavotti; παυσαμένην West ap. e.p.

παλλομένην legi posse recte negans, παρφαμένην Slings (this edition); νεβρ[: νέβραχ' ἤτασα Theiler 1977 νεβρίον West ap. e.p. – χύσα Albertz (privatim) – λάβον Slings (this edition) – τρέμειν Gronewald ap. Merkelbach 1975 – φίλευν Lasserre – φυγῆς West ap. e.p. νεβρὸν West ap. e.p. – ἄσθματος Barigazzi – βλήμενον* Gentili ap. Degani-Burzaechini – ἔκδυον vel – ἔκλυον vel – λυσάμην* vel – εἶμ' ἕλον vel – ζῶμ' ἕλον* Casanova – ἐζύγουν Kamerbeek – εἱλόμην Page ap. e.p. – ἐκ φυγῆς West ap. e.p. – ἐκράτουν Kamerbeek – ἔντυον Van Sickle *QUCC* – ἤλασα Barigazzi – ἡμέρουν Ebert-Luppe – ἠπίουν Stoessl – ἤροσα Barigazzi – ἥρπασα Gallavotti et Marzullo – ἤτασα Theiler *Poet.* – θελγόμην* Van Sickle ap. Degani 1974 – θελξάμην* Degani 1974 νεβρὸς πρὸς λύχον* Marcovich.

32]ων: μαζῶν West ap. e.p. μαστῶν Theiler μηρῶν Merkelbach ap. e.p. φαύων Gallavotti; τε] δὲ Barigazzi.

33]..εφαινε: ῄ γὰρ ἔφηνε Gallavotti ἡ γὰρ ἔφηνε Barigazzi – δ' ἄρ' ἔφηνε Bossi – παρέφηνε Marzullo ἧι παρέφηνε West ap. e.p. ἧιπερ ἔφηνε Page *SLG* ὧν παρέφηνε Kamerbeek; ἐπήλυσιν e.p. ἐπ' ἤλυσιν Lasserre ἐπήλυσις Page *SLG*; χρόα e.p. χροῆ Gallavotti χροΐ Slings 1980.

34]ε: ἅπαν δὲ Van Sickle *QUCC* ἅπαν τε West ap. e.p. ἐγὼ δὲ Snell ap. e.p. ἤδη τε Koenen ap. Merkelbach 1975.

35]ον: ἀργὸν Gallavotti ap. Sisti ἔνδον Casanova θερμὸν West ap. e.p. θοῦρον Ruijgh (privatim) λευκὸν Merkelbach ap. e.p. ὀρθὸν Gallavotti σῶφρον Theiler τούμὸν Van Sickle *QUCC* necnon Gentili et Pellizer ibid. ὑγρὸν Degani 1974 et Perusino ibid. χλωρὸν Austin ap. Merkelbach 1975; ξανθῆς ⟨τ'⟩ Theiler 1977; ἐπιψαυ[: ἐπιψαῦον Barigazzi ἐπιψαῦσαι γονῆς Gallavotti *Hlk.* ἐπιψαύσας Lasserre ἐπιψαύων e.p. – κόμης quidam ap. Marzullo – κόρης* Gallavotti – τριχός e.p. – φλογός Slings 1980 – χνοός Taplin ap. Van Sickle *CJ*.

1 **ἀνασχόμενος, πο over να**: ἀποσχόμενος is either a correction or a variant (see introduction); it is preferable either way: ἀνα- is easily explained as due to perseveration of -παν; 'abstaining' (sexually; cf. Ξ 206f.) suits the context better than 'tolerating'; πάμπαν, when not preceded by a negative (and οὐ/μή...πάμπαν separated by verse-end is very unlikely here) is used mainly with verbs with a negative meaning (e.g. Α 422 ἀποπαύεο πάμπαν).

ἶσον δὲ τολμ[: Either a statement about the speaker herself ('I shall do likewise') or one about the addressee ('you can (must) do likewise'). In the latter case ἀποσχόμενος has to be part of a description of similar behaviour by another man. As sexual abstinence must be presumed to go without saying for a girl of these times and places, the latter alternative is preferable by far (by the same token, I do not think that ἶσον should be interpreted as 'similar to me'). τόλμησον plus infinitive (φρονεῖν

cf. O 50; S. *Ant.* 374; A. *Pr.* 999f., or τελεῖν) seems most acceptable, but τολμητόν τι σοί deserves serious consideration (cf. Sapph. fr. 31,17).

2-5 In case her addressee 'is in a hurry' (and therefore not prepared to wait), the speaker suggests that he should take another beautiful girl, living in her house. This girl is introduced in a manner which appears to imply that the speaker thinks that this girl is unknown to the man.

Who is this girl? In his subsequent speech, the narrator first points out that waiting does not necessarily mean total abstinence; he then goes on to revile Neoboule in terms that echo the description of the girl offered in these lines (4 καλὴ τέρεινα παρθένος: 17 πέπειρα, 18 ἄνθος δ' ἀπερρύηκε παρθενήϊον, 20 γυνή, possibly 5 φίλην: 25 φίλους; cf. also 17 ἄλλος ἀνὴρ ἐχέτω). His speech ends on the keynote with which this section of this speech begins (2 ἐπείγεαι: 26 ἐπειγόμενος). The structure of the two speeches as well as these echoes strongly suggest that the παρθένος recommended here is Neoboule.

But if so, it is remarkable that the speaker here implies that the narrator does not know Neoboule (even if we do not identify him with Archilochus at this stage, he goes on to reveal his knowledge of Neoboule in no uncertain terms). This has led several scholars (Treu, 109ff.; Kamerbeek, 121; Raubitschek) to suppose that the speaker offers not Neoboule but herself. We should then have to conclude that she had mentioned Neoboule in the first part of her speech (lost but for line 1), and that the narrator replies to her speech in chiastic order, cf. Treu, 118: "alte Liebe (= Neoboule) + neue Liebe (es gibt da eine: mich)...neue Liebe (= du) + alte Liebe (= Neoboule)". This explanation accounts for most of the verbal echoes (and indeed creates another one: παρθένος 4 and 28, so Raubitschek), but not for the repetition of ἐπείγεσθαι. The logic of the third person instead of the first (Treu, 109: "da keine Namen gebraucht werden, kann man notfalls alles wieder in Abrede stellen, und das Empfinden für das Schickliche wird niemals verletzt") is not abundantly clear, and the veiled manner in which she offers herself has no function in the rest of the poem. Why, if the girl offers herself, is it the narrator who brings up and settles for one of the other, lesser 'pleasures of the goddess'? And why is the girl so scared (31 τὼς ὥστε νεβρ̣[)?

Though this interpretation cannot perhaps be excluded (and deserves more attention than it is generally given), I see no satisfactory answers to these questions, and shall proceed from the identity of the recommended girl with Neoboule. Why then does the speaker here imply that the narrator is unfamiliar with her? I believe that this question can be answered satisfactorily by the analysis of 16-27 as a climax not just in the description of Neoboule but at the same time of the narrator's past in-

volvement with her: he is not unfamiliar with her, indeed he gradually reveals that he knows her only too well (cf. below ad 16-27).

There can be little doubt that Neoboule is the speaker's sister: they live under the same roof (ἐν ἡμετέρου: this does not suggest simply a θίασος, unless it is a 'Mädchenpensionat' such as has been postulated for Sappho's circle of girls; but there is no evidence that these girls actually lived with her). Though the girl's father's name is not given (but perhaps fr. 38 is part of this poem), it is very likely that he is Lycambes; the verbal echoes mentioned above indicate that Neoboule is an older sister (cf. West's supplement in 17).

2 **εἰ**: Iota cancelled by an oblique stroke (cf. 31), apparently by mistake. εἰ δ' ὦν: Not the later idiomatic εἰ δ' οὖν "but supposing that really (which I don't expect or hope)" (Denniston, 464-466). The following proposal is too serious to be introduced in this way. In fact, we have here a collocation of εἰ and δ' οὖν marking a major transition (found already Hes. fr. 25,10 M.-W.) as e.g. Pl. *R*. 494d; D. 18,277; perhaps A. *Ag*. 676 and E. *HF* 213.

ἐπείγεαι: Haste is traditionally opposed to good counsel (Ant. V 94 οὐ τῶν ἐπειγομένων...ἀλλὰ τῶν εὖ βουλευομένων; Theogn. 1051f.; Th. I 85,1) and in this poem careful deliberation is mentioned once (12) and hinted at 26f. (with a verbal echo of ἐπείγεαι). If used absolutely, ἐπείγομαι does not normally bear the secondary meaning 'to be eager', and I see no compelling reason for introducing it here.

καί σε θυμὸς ἰθύει: For the coupling of more or less synonymical expressions, cf. 14; 18f.; 24; Slings 1980-82, 14. Cf. *Hy. Herm*. 475 ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὖν τοι θυμὸς ἐπιθύει κιθαρίζειν. ἰθύω is used as a causative (as B. 10,51) because of its association of 'rashness', absent in the normal causative form ἰθύνω. Cf. Slings 1976; M. G. Bonanno, MCr 10-12 (1975-77), 37-43; Slings 1980-82; Bonanno, MCr 15-17 (1980-82), 15-17.

3 **ἔστιν ἐν ἡμετέρου**: The phrasing and word-order ('there is', place, relative clause, attributes, noun) reminds one of similar descriptions in Homer; if so, this is, like most epicisms of this poem, mock sollemnity. There is no reason for the girl to be ironic, but there is for the poet (the girl seems hardly to be given a character of her own).

ἐν ἡμετέρου: Hitherto not attested before Hdt. (e.g. I 35,4), but cf. εἰς ἡμετέρου (attested as a variant β 55; ρ 534; η 301 and by all MSS *Hy. Herm*. 370; ἐν ἡμετέρωι is not found at all). The expression always means "in(to) our house".

νῦν: Contrasts the offered girl's willingness with the speaker's reluctance.

μέγ' ἱμείρει: Cf. fr. 89,5 μέγ' ἱμείροντες. The supplement is either 'for you', but disyllabic σέο is not found in iambus or elegy and σέθεν is too

strongly epical (not found in iambus; perhaps σ' ἔχειν, though ἔχω 'to have as husband' does not seem to be found before Call. fr. 75,27), or 'for marriage', more in particular for the sexuality that goes with it. For γάμου may be adduced Hes. fr. 37,6 M.-W. ἱμερόεντα γάμον, against λέχεος, its explicitness.

4 **καλὴ τέρεινα παρθένος**: Imitated by Hippon. fr. 119 W. = 120 Deg. εἴ μοι γένοιτο παρθένος καλή τε καὶ τέρεινα. The asyndetic pattern Adj. + Adj. + Noun is unusual (and strikingly un-epic: contrast α 130f. θρόνον...καλὸν, δαιδάλεον; fr. 35 βοῦς...ἐργάτης..., κορωνός, ἔργων ἴδρις); fr. 8 εὐπλοκάμου πολιῆς ἁλός provides a highly uncertain parallel; Semon. fr. 7,50 δύστηνον οἰζυρὸν γένος.

τέρεινα: Epithet of (a.o.) the skin (Δ 237, Ξ 406, Hes. *Op.* 522), here for the first time applied to a person with a tender skin (cf. ad 18), as Hippon. *l.c.*; Theogn. 261.

δοκέω: not necessarily a "höfliche Einschränkung der Aussage" (Gelzer, 22 and 21 n. 28) any more than when Odysseus says (θ 180f.) ἐν πρώτοισιν οἴω ἔμμεναι. For δοκέω denoting a supposition other than a future or erroneous one, cf. Anan. fr. 5,9 West; B. 18,12. See R. A. Prier, Platon 32-33, 1980-81, 318-323, who perceives irony here, no doubt wrongly.

μιṇ: a trace of ink immediately to the right of the upper end of the iota.

5 **εἶδος ἄμωμον**: cf. Hes. *Th.* 259 εἶδος ἄμωμος. The adjective (not in Homer) also Semon. fr. 4; Anacr. 414 *PMG*. For εἶδος ἔχειν cf. δ 14; Hes. *Th.* 908 etc.

The accent on πόιη[does not necessarily imply ποίησαι (as distinguished from ποιῆσαι or ποιήσαι; so Ebert-Luppe): ποίησον plus infinitive is, in principle, possible. For ποίησαι φίλην, cf. Hes. *Op.* 713f.; Sol. fr. 37,5; Semon. fr. 7,62; infra 25—the expression is not used elsewhere in an amorous context and the interpretation 'make her yours' (cf. I 397; ε 120; Ι 146) introduces the epic sense of φίλος, unparalleled in iambus.

6 **τοσαῦτ' ἐφώνεε**: Cf. 28. Both transitive φωνέω and τοσαῦτα (τόσα) concluding a reported speech (*Hy. Herm.* 94; B. 3,48; A. *Pers.* 372; perhaps Alc. fr. 112,21 V.) are probably innovations.

ἐφώνεε, iota (and high point) added s.l.: Papyri of Ionic lyricists have a marked tendency to write εε(ι), even when metre requires ει (cf. Archil. fr. 181,4); conversely, they favour ευ much more than εο. Recent editors (notably West) adopt a phonologically correct spelling (ει; ε͜ο; cf. West 1974, 80), but as evidence for 7th-century Ionic orthography is scanty and the date of the first written text of Archilochus quite uncertain, it seems best not to tamper with the tradition, which is, in this respect, identical to that of Herodotus (A.H.R.E. Paap, *De Herodoti reliquiis in papyris et membranis Aegyptiis servatis*, Lugduni Batavorum 1948, 85-88).

Besides, it should be noted that epigraphical evidence suggests that already in the sixth century, εο and ευ were identical in Ionic.

τὴν δ' ἐγὼνταμει̣[βόμην: Cf. ad *A*, 7 (where α was probably corrected to η); Ebert-Luppe, 232 n. 15.

For the absence of the temporal augment, cf. also fr. 41,2; West 1974 105; below ad 31. ἀνταμείβομαι is found first in Archilochus, in various meanings.

7-27 The girl had suggested total abstinence (till marriage) or Neoboule. The I first points out a way to sexual pleasure apart from full coitus; this answers the first suggestion. He then goes on (in the middle of 16: τὸ δὴ νῦν γνῶθι) to reject Neoboule. In other words, this speech apparently reflects the structure of the preceding one; cf. ad 27 ἐπειγόμενος. A closer analysis of 7-16 may enable us to reconstruct the girl's speech.

He starts with the other 'pleasures of the goddess'; I suppose he had proposed the θεῖον χρῆμα at first, but the girl had turned this down. The precise nature of one of these 'other pleasures' is not clarified until 14-16; first, 'these matters' are brought in, only to be postponed till some later opportunity when they can be discussed at ease (11-13). Now ταῦτα (11) cannot refer to (one of) the other pleasures, since these are not in fact postponed, as appears from the narrative (cf. ad 35). Nor is it likely to refer to the θεῖον χρῆμα (this would, I think, have required τοῦτο). If the explanation of θεῖον χρῆμα as full coitus is correct, ταῦτα refers to marriage, which is indeed something that should be discussed ἐφ' ἡσυχίης. The promise πείσομαι ὥς με κέλεαι (13) means that the speaker is prepared to postpone full coitus till marriage, but the following θριγκοῦ δ'...μή τι μέγαιρε shows that he does not settle for total abstinence.

We may deduce from this (cf. Van Sickle 1976; Slings 1980; *Studi* II), that the girl had not completely rejected the proposed coitus but had suggested it for later, to wit, after they would have been married (it is very unlikely, given the words ταῦτα δ' ἐφ' ἡσυχίης...βουλεύσομεν, that she had already promised to consent to full intercourse at some later time without this proviso).

The structure of the speeches, therefore, seems to be as follows. The girl rejects coitus for the present (1.1.), suggests it for later, after marriage (1.2.), and offers Neoboule as an alternative (2.). The I suggests other pleasures (1.1.), postpones the discussion of marriage and full coitus (1.2.), again asks her to grant him one of the other pleasures (1.1.') and rejects Neoboule (2.). Note δέ at the beginning of 1.2. (11) and 1.1.' (14).

The ABA structure in 9-16 is logical: the girl's identification of sexual pleasure with marriage is wrong; he cannot ignore the girl's willingness to marry him later, but marriage is sandwiched between the lesser pleasures because they are what really matters.

The structure of the whole speech serves a double purpose. The first part with its sexual peripety (followed up by the narrative) enables the narrator to suggest that there has been sexual contact (of whichever nature) between him and Neoboule's younger sister. Had she flatly rejected him, this would not have been possible; had she accepted his original proposal, there would have been no cause for him to revile Neoboule. I therefore believe that the I is to be identified with Archilochus (on the question, cf. West 1975; Rösler; J. M. Bremer, *Het gemaskerde ik*, Amsterdam 1978, 8-16; Slings 1980, 331-334; *Studi* III; F. Bossi, QS 7, 1981, 117-142; C. Miralles-J. Pòrtulas, *Archilochus and the Iambic Poetry*, Roma 1983, 129-157): by means of the alternative 'coitus later: Neoboule now', countered with 'lesser pleasures now: Neoboule never', he is able to insult Lycambes (father of the younger girl) and Neoboule at the same time. Of course this does not mean that the meeting described here is necessarily historical (cf. *Studi* III).

7 Ἀμφιμεδοῦς θύγατερ: Why is she addressed with her mother's name? "In magic a person is always identified by his/her mother's name. That way one can be certain!" (P. J. Sijpesteijn, private communication). It is customary for hetaeras and other *demi-mondaines* (cf. Herod. 6,20; 50; Lasserre, 317), to be referred to like this (their father's names are often unknown, cf. esp. Ath. 587b); it seems to be a slur on an effeminate young man (S. fr. 564 Radt: cf. E. fr. 1064; roughly similar S. *El.* 365-367), or alternatively on a father who has married above his social rank (E. *El.* 933-938). If the girl is indeed Lycambes' daughter, this may have been Archilochus' intention: Lycambes is, by implication, not ἐσθλός τε καὶ (?). However, the emphasis on Amphimedo's death cannot be explained in this way. From a number of other explanations I quote Henderson's (165): "It is usually the mother who watches over a daughter's pubescence (cf. Nausicaa at *Od.* 6.25); that Amphimedo is dead (1) indicates that the girl now lacks her protection and advice, and (2) indirectly but emphatically underscores the shortness of youth and its joys (shortly to be mentioned)". In the face of this and similar speculations it seems best to confess that we do not understand what the poet means because we lack the knowledge about Amphimedo which he imparted in the lost part of the poem or took for granted in his public. The name Ἀμφιμέδων is attested twice in Thasos (*IG* XII 8, 279, 12 and 376, 7); this should discourage the assumption of a 'speaking name'.

Ἀμφιμεδοῦς: The accent was first a semi-circular circumflex, through which one of the angular type has been written.

The accent on ἐσθλης is, I think, an acute (shaped like that on 15 μέγαιρε and on 30 ἀγκάλησ; cf. the iota over ἐφώνεε in 6): it looks as if whoever wrote this sign worked hastily and read θύγατερ ἐσθλή by mistake. But it is also possible, and perhaps preferable, to assume that

the acute was written instead of the circumflex because of the following enclitic; cf. *P.Oxy.* 223 (*Iliad* V, early third century) 176 πολλών τε; 192 τών κε.

Of the supplements, σαόφρονος (the uncontracted scansion may be defended by fr. 188,2 (= *C*, 2) γήραος, trisyllabic) is often coupled with ἐσθλός/ἀγαθός as a standard eulogy of deceased women (E. *Alc.* 615f.; *Epigr.Gr.* 51,1; 53,2 Kaibel). But maybe we should look for an epithet that denotes a superior social status.

8 Cf. the Homeric formula γαῖα καθέξει (Π 629 etc.); Β 699 ἔχεν κάτα γαῖα μέλαινα. The expression is not found elsewhere in iambus or elegy (a variation Theogn. 292 γῆν κατὰ πᾶσαν ἔχει; cf. A. *Pers.* 387). The tmesis (not found in Archilochus' trimetric poems; cf. ad *D* I 4) adds to the lofty tone (it should be noted that it is unusual for a single adjective to come between preverb and verb, cf. ad. iamb. 38,9 and perhaps *C*, 3), as does the adjective εὐρώεσσα, used in epic poetry for Hades (Υ 65; ψ 322; Hes. *Th.* 731; *Op.* 153). As an epithet of earth it is explained by Simon. 531,4f. *PMG* ἐντάφιον δὲ τοιοῦτον οὔτ' εὐρὼς οὔθ' ὁ πανδαμάτωρ ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος (cf. S. *Ai.* 1167; Q.S. 14,241); it is unnecessary, therefore, to assume that Archilochus re-etymologized it as a derivation of εὐρύς, as later poets and lexicographers did (in itself such a procedure is not unthinkable, cf. fr. 38; fr. 272 and Slings 1980-82, 13 n. 12). For the median diaeresis, cf. Appendix 2.2.1.

9 θεῆς: The form in -ή is very rare before the Alexandrians (Antim. fr. 186; SEG 19, 1963, 568), but its use is imperative here, as θεοῦ would be ambiguous and θεᾶς too epical.

ἀνδρ̣[άσιν (a minimal trace of ink after δ): The girl's pleasure, if any, is not taken into account, cf. ad 30 and 34.

10 παρὲξ⟦ε⟧ τὸ θεῖον χρῆμα: quoted by Hsch. π 839 Schm., and paraphrased ἔξω τῆς μίξεως (Degani, QUCC 20, 1975, 229), apparently derived from a commentary on this poem (cf. ad 17 and 33). That the θεῖον χρῆμα is, indeed, coitus rather than marriage is not proved by this (though the commentator could read the entire poem, as we could not), but marriage in itself is not a τέρψις Ἀφροδίτης, certainly not for the young men meant here.

παρεξ: Grammarians and tradition waver between πάρεξ and παρέξ; in this papyrus, the gravis could mean either (cf. 2 εἰ; 3 ἐν; 8 κὰτ etc.; 3 ἣμετερου; 32 χὲρσιν on the one hand; 27 and 31 τὼς; 38 = *C*, 3 γλυκὺ̣ς on the other). Hsch. *l.c.* reads πάρεξ. -ξ is frequently found before consonants, cf. διὲξ fr. 32 and 46. Here used for the first time meaning 'besides, except'; apparently the following case is variable (accusative here, genitive Schwyzer *DGE* 732 B 4 and permanently after the sixth century). It is not certain that the ε after παρεξ is cancelled, but there is a little too much ink.

θεῖον: Dioscorides (V 2 G.-P. = *AP* V 55) uses ἀθάνατος γέγονα to refer to orgasm; cf. ad 28 and 35.

τῶν: One expects τέων (cf. fr. 89,12), but cf. Sol. fr. 27,15. The form must be prepositive in order to comply with Knox' bridge (Appendix 2.3.4.), but I am reluctant to assume that it is a relative pronoun, as this would yield a lame sentence (and even more irregular syntax). See Appendix 2.2.4.

τις: Koenen 1980 defends τίς, but the thought is not improved (it becomes a rhetorical question with a negative answer; besides, I think that the promise of 15f. is understandable only if one of the other pleasures is meant).

ἀρκέσει: The earliest occurrence of the meaning 'to be sufficient'.

11 ἐπ' ἡσυχίης: opposed to ἐπείγεαι (2, *q.v.*) and ἐπειγόμενος (27). The expression does not recur until Ar. *Vesp.* 1517 and in the 'commentary' on Sappho, S 261A1,7 *SLG*. The psilosis (cf. introduction) is due to mistaken correction of the tradition (cf. West 1974, 88f.).

εὖτε: an epicism, absent from Hipponax and from Archilochus' poems in trimeters and tetrameters (fr. 3,2 — elegy —; fr. 182,1 — epode with hemiepes, as here —).

μελανθῇ[ι: The supplement may not violate Porson's Law, hence only a postpositive word (not any monosyllable) will do. It is, to my mind at any rate, unlikely that the reference should be to coming nightfall, even though night is traditionally the time for taking counsel (cf. Phocyl. fr. 8 D. νυκτὸς βουλεύειν κτέ; Hdt. VII 12,1: Ps.-Epich. fr. 270; 271; Men. *Epitr.* 252 and Gomme-Sandbach *ad loc.*): an appointment for the following night for discussion of the ταῦτα is, within the framework of this poem, an intolerable *corpus alienum* (and no satisfactory supplement has been found). It has to be some later time, that is, *ad Kalendas Graecas*. μοι γένυς (cf. D. A. Campbell, CQ 28, 1978, 473f.) is, again, backed up by a commonplace of Greek literature (one cannot contemplate marriage before one has a beard; cf. Alc. fr. 120,9 V. and the scholium ad 5; Pi. *O.* 1,67-69), but the speaker had already contemplated marriage with Neoboule (21-23; cf. below, ad 16-27). σοι φύσις (pudendum muliebre; cf. Theiler 1977, 66) seems to be contradicted by ποη[κήπους. We are then left with the interpretation of Ebert-Luppe (227f.) "when your grape has turned dark", i.e. when you have grown up. Cf. Philodem. *Epigr.* X 1f. G.-P. = *AP* V 124 οὐδὲ μελαίνει βότρυς ὁ παρθενίους πρωτοβολῶν χάριτας; Honestus I 3 G.-P. = *AP* V 20; *AP* XII 205,3f. (Strato); V 304 (adesp.); Ps.-Theoc. 27,10; Horat. *Carm.* II 5,9-12. No suitable supplement (a disyllabic word to follow τοι) has been found. Cf. Slings 1975; Henderson, 179 n. 46; Degani 1977, 24 and n. 24; *Studi* II n. 17. Maybe one should look for another fruit (e.g. μόρον, cf. S. fr. 395). For μελαίνομαι, 'to ripen', cf. Hes. *Scut.* 300; Σ 595.

12 σὺν θεῶι (iota added below the line): 'with help from heaven', cf. I 49; S. *Ai.* 765. θεός is used generically in this expression.

13 π̣είσομαι: two very tiny dots of ink to the left of ε, one at letter-top height, the other near letter bottom; they may be the ends of an upright but are too wide apart to belong to the semicircle of a φ. There is no room for one more letter to the left of]π̣.

πείσομαι ὥς με κέλεαι: cf. Ψ 96 πείσομαι ὡς σὺ κελεύεις (there is a v.l. ὥς με). The expression means "I shall do as you tell me", not "I shall obey, like you tell me to" (cf. the Homeric formula ὡς ἂν ἐγὼ εἴπω πειθώμεθα πάντες); it is wrong to infer that the girl had actually said πείθεο (cf. Merkelbach ap. Kramer-Hagedorn).

πολλόν μ' ε.[: As a new sentence begins with θριγκοῦ, this is probably an asyndetic clause explaining why the speaker will do as he is told. After ε, a spot of ink immediately to the right of the horizontal bar of ε; on a fibre above this spot, a stroke beginning to the left of the spot. The fibre is now bent so that fibre and spot meet; if it were straightened, one would see a short horizontal bar, at the same height as the top of ε: β γ ζ η ξ π ρ or τ. (If the fibre is not completely straightened, α δ λ μ ν and χ would also be possible, but definitely unlikely). πολλόν μ' ἐπ̣[έσσυται (cf. I 398 μοι... πολλὸν ἐπέσσυτο θυμός; A 173; I 42: Z 631) with μ' = μοι as in fr. 215, is acceptable, but πόθος is not (and νόος doubtful). Perhaps πολλόν μ' ἐπ̣[ορνύεις πόθον (cf. Y 93 μοι ἐπῶρσε μένος; X 204; η 270f. οἰζυῖ πολλῆι, τήν μοι ἐπῶρσε).

14 θ]ρ̣ιγκοῦ (a tiny spot of ink to the left of the iota) and **πυλέων**: It is very unlikely that a building is described (cf. η 87f.) because σχήσω...κήπους would then mean "For I shall drive (ride) to the gardens". Are we really to believe that the speaker invites the girl for a ride in the park? (and why γάρ?). Can the description 28f. mean that she has accepted the invitation? In fact, the sexual activities at the end of the poem must have some justification in this speech (the girl had turned the speaker down in 1-5) and I doubt that 9f. is sufficient to persuade the girl. We have to do with sexual metaphors, but they are less clear than elsewhere in Archilochus (e.g. the 'blind eels' of fr. 189)—in this respect they match the following narrative.

A θριγκός is a row of stones on top of a wall (or a fence, but ἔνερθε probably excludes that meaning); here probably the *os pubis*. The word is used metaphorically Ar. *Thesm.* 60, but that looks rather like an *ad hoc* joke (θριγκός had been used literally in 58); cf. J. Taillardat, *Les images d'Aristophane*, Paris 1965^2, 70; Casanova, 33f. n. 38. For πύλη, cf. Ar. *Lys.* 1163; Anaxandr. fr. 33,17; *AP* V 242,3 (Eratosthenes Scholasticus); Hippon. fr. 92,2 W. = 95,2 Deg. πυγεῶνα (a comical deformation of πυλεών; cf. Degani 1977, 29 n. 35) and the similar use of θύρα (Archil.

fr. 47 possibly; Semon. fr. 17; Hippon. fr. 92,14 W. = 95,14 Deg.; Taillardat, *o.c.*, 70f.; 404 n. 4).

ἔνερθε: usually 'under', though 'from under' is possible if there are enough contextual signals (cf. A. *Pers.* 222); such signals are absent from our text and I doubt if they can be supplied at the end of this line. The preposition suits θριγκοῦ better than πυλέων; there is a slight zeugma: "under the coping and in the gate".

ὑποφ[: After omikron, the left-hand part of a semicircle and a dot in its centre (this excludes σ̣, thought possible by Hagedorn ap. Degani-Burzacchini). Syntax requires a verb, and metre ('Wilamowitz' Bridge', cf. Appendix 2.2.3.) excludes ὕπο. ὑποφθάνειν does not suit the sense very well (it does not elsewhere mean 'to be first', but 'to be earlier'), and its α is probably long. I can think of nothing better than ὑποφλύσαι (not attested, cf. fr. 45 ἀπέφλυσαν), which would continue and clarify the metaphor.

15 μέγαιρε: An epicism, not found elsewhere in iambus (cf. Sol. fr. 20,1).

σχήσω: Pseudo-intransitive for 'to drive' or 'to steer'; the metaphor is either nautical or hippical: "I shall keep to the grassy meadows", cf. γ 182 Πύλονδ' ἔχον; Π 378; Ψ 466 σχεθέειν περὶ τέρμα; N 326. If K.-G I 170 correctly attribute an aorist value to σχήσω, the meaning is either 'to land' (cf. Hdt. VIII 40,1; 2 σχεῖν πρὸς Σαλαμῖνα; Ar. *Ran.* 188 ποῖ σχήσειν δοκεῖς); or 'to change course' (cf. Ψ 466 quoted above). What matters is the speaker's promise to arrive eventually at the "grassy meadows", made to support his request to do whatever it is he wants to do "under the coping and the gate".

ποη[: To the various equivalent supplements may be added ποηφύτους (cf. A. fr. 273a1 Radt ποιοφύτων) and ποηνόμους (cf. A. *Supp.* 50 ποιονόμοις). ποη- is probably a hybrid orthography (πόα < ποία is a development confined to Attic), but cf. IG XII 5,1076,40; 53 Ποέσσηι-Ποιήσσηι; Hp. *Vict.* II 49 ποηφάγων.

16 κ]ήπους: The *mons Veneris*; cf. Hsch. κ 2529 Latte ἐφήβαιον τῶν γυναικῶν; Archipp. fr. 2,2f.; D.L. II 116; Anacr. 446 *PMG*; similarly λειμών (E. *Cycl.* 171) and πεδίον (Ar. *Av.* 507; *Lys.* 88). These parallels refute Henderson's interpretation (168), who thinks that full penetration is meant, quoting Pi. *P.* 9,37 (where 'cutting grass' is better taken—as a variation on the familiar 'picking flowers'; cf. 110; Bremer 1975, 273f.—to be a less precise metaphor for the consummation of love). The poetic plural (cf. fr. 8,1; 31,2; 191,3) suits the passage, and the word is emphasized by the enjambment (cf. Appendix 2.5.5.).

16-27 There are four stages in the description of Neoboule: her beauty has withered (17-19); she is insatiable and frenzied (19f.); she will not

make a fitting wife (21-23); she is unfaithful and promiscuous (24f.). The first two statements are separated from the last two by the violent outburst ἐς κόρακας ἄπεχε, the second and fourth are given as explanations (γάρ, 19 and 24) of the first and third. Note that word-end after the second anceps is found in all trimeters of the poem except in 18-24 (26 is a border-line case): this apparently serves to underline the emotion, as does the irregularity in 21.

There is of course a climax in the four statements: Neoboule's portrait becomes blacker with every sentence. But at the same time, the statements reveal an ever closer intimacy of the speaker with Neoboule: he knows her beauty, her lust; she is unsuitable as his wife; she is promiscuous. I believe that this intimacy is best explained if we treat the passage as descriptive not just of Neoboule but of the speaker's relationship with her: he was attracted by her beauty, had sexual contact, intended to marry her and was put off by her unfaithfulness (cf. Slings 1976, 287).

This interpretation does not necessarily entail the identification of the I with Archilochus; on the other hand, if this is indeed the correct reading of the passage, a strong case can be made for the identification, since ancient biographical tradition states that it had indeed been Archilochus' intention to marry Neoboule (both the tradition and Archilochus—in fr. 172-181—suggest that this intention was not realized because of Lycambes breaking his oath, but Archilochus may very well have suggested one cause in that poem and another one here).

The themes of this passage are worked out with considerable vigour in the Second Cologne Epode, cf. *C*.

τὸ δὴ νῦν γνῶθι: Both δὴ νῦν and δή νυν are frequent in commands (Denniston, 218), and this particular command is a favourite with Archilochus (fr. 89,17 γνῶθι νυν; fr. 113,9 ἴσθι νυν, τάδ' ἴσθι - accentuation uncertain in either case). The νῦν of our papyrus is correct if the scribe followed the theory of Aristarchus, who prescribed νῦν everywhere unless the vowel is demonstrably short; the modern distinction between νῦν as a temporal adverb and the enclitic νυν as a particle goes back to Tyrannio (cf. C. J. Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*, Assen 1957, 64-67). Anyway, a temporal interpretation of νῦν (νυν) is quite possible (the discussion of marriage is postponed, but you may know the following right now).

It is not certain that τὸ δὴ νῦν γνῶθι refers to the following words, but it is at least likely that it does. "Know this (now)" as a conclusion of the promise made in the previous lines, is rather feeble to my taste. The parallels quoted above suggest that the sentences containing such imperatives serve as announcements.

Νεοβούλη[ν: There can be little doubt that N. is object of ἐχέτω. Of the supplements proposed, γέ τις is the least unacceptable (though Archilochos seems to have avoided γε).

17 ἄ]λλος ἀνὴρ ἐχέτω: Cf. Theogn. 262 ἄλλος ἀνὴρ κατέχει; ἐχέτω 'to have for a wife' (cf. 22 and ad 3). The suggestion made in 5, at the end of the first speech, is countered at the beginning of the second part of this one.

αἰαῖ...παρθενήϊον: Imitated by Theoc. 7,120f. καὶ δὴ μὰν ἀπίοιο (μαλαπίοιο cj. Maas) πεπαίτερος, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες αἰαῖ φαντι Φιλῖνε, τό τοι καλὸν ἄνθος ἀπορρεῖ (see Henrichs, 14f.).

αἰαῖ: Found also Theogn. 1341; B. 5,153.

πέπειρα; Cf. Anacr. 432,1 *PMG* κνυζή τις ἤδη καὶ πέπειρα γίνομαι; Ar. *Eccl.* 895. In archaic and classical Greek, this word (and πέπειρος) is in itself a negative qualification of human physical beauty; in later Greek (Plu. *Lyc.* 15,4; *AP* XII 185,3 (Strato); Honestus I 3 G.-P. = *AP* V 20) it becomes positive ('mature' as opposed to 'green, too young' and 'over-ripe').

δ.[: West (1977, 46-48) here supplies fr. 242 δὶς τόση (Hsch. δ 78 Latte, glossed τῆι ἡλικίαι. Ἀρχίλοχος; N.B. not τόσηι), which makes good sense. The gloss is evidently derived from a commentator who interpreted τόση as 'so old' (cf. *Od.* α 207). It is probably slightly hyperbolic to call Neoboule 'twice as old (as you)', but in this context it is acceptable enough (I do not understand why Neoboule should be "bigger as well as older than her adolescent sister": 'twice as big' would be ridiculous). Henrichs' interpretation of δὶς τόση as δὶς πέπειρα (12f.) is untenable (it would require δὶς τόσον and his translation "is she ripe, overripe" overlooks the value of πέπειρα). But the palaeographical evidence for printing δι̣.[(so Kramer-Hagedorn) is insufficient. West's description of the traces of ink is, according to my observations, correct, but they could just as well be interpreted as δη̣[(traces of an upright and of a horizontal stroke to its right at letter-top height; the horizontal bar of η frequently ends at letter-top height in this hand). It should be noted that Koenen (1980, 197) reports that in 1975 he read δω̣[; this cannot now be read, but it is possible that the fibres were moved since then (West's re-examination took place in 1977). δή is, of course, unobjectionable, but no convincing supplement has been found (λίην or ἄγαν is superfluous). On balance, it seems best to accept West's integration, though I do so with considerably less certainty since I have examined the papyrus.

18 ἄ]ν̣θος (an upright to the left of θ)...παρθενήϊον: cf. *Hy. Dem.* 108 κουρήϊον ἄνθος; N 484 ἥβης ἄνθος; Hes. *Th.* 998; *Hy. Herm.* 375; Sol. fr. 25,1; Tyrt. fr. 10,28; Theogn. 1007f.; Simon. fr. eleg. 8,6 etc. Cf. Casadio, who rightly warns against introducing here the Roman and

Christian notion of *flos virginitatis*: it is the beauty of her maidenly youth, not her maidenly chastity that Neoboule is here said to have lost. The words are an indirect echo of καλὴ τέρεινα παρθένος (4): τέρεν ἄνθος is a fixed formula in archaic poetry (ι 449 etc.; Hes. and *Hy. Herm.* as quoted above, both with ἥβης added). See Degani-Burzacchini for later parallels, esp. *AP* XI 374,5-7 (Maced.) τὴν χάριν ἐξέρρευσας ὅσην ἔχες...ὡς δὲ ῥόδον θαλέθεσκες; cf. ad *C*, 1.

δ': There is a small trace of ink to the right of δ, possibly an apostrophos.

ἀπερρύηκε: The normal word for the falling out of leaves (Arist. *GA* 783b14 etc.), hairs (Arist. *HA* 518a14) and the like. This is the earliest instance of the perfect ἐρρύηκα (formed after ἐρρύην), but cf. perfects of verbs denoting similar processes like σέσηπα, τέτηκα. Cf. Hes. fr. 132 τέρεν ὤλεσεν ἄνθος.

19 κ]ạὶ χάρις: The explanation is added to the metaphor; cf. fr. 105.

ἣ πρὶν ἐπῆν: Cf. E 127 (ἀχλύν) ἣ πρὶν ἐπῆεν.

κόρον: Either 'satiety' (in that case, e.g. οὐχ̣ [ἔχει πόθου after Austin's πόθων, cf. E. *Alc.* 185 δακρύων εἶχεν κόρον; *AP* V 255,3 οὐ κόρον εἶχον ἔρωτος (Paulus Silent.)) or (in a derived sense) 'impudence'. The first alternative yields a better explanation (γάρ) of the preceding sentence.

20]ης δὲ μέτρ' ἔφηνε: μέτρον is here probably 'the full measure of', as often in connection with ἥβης (Λ 225; σ 217; Theogn. 1119 etc.; cf. σοφίης μέτρον Sol. fr. 13,52), but what we need here is a negative phrase, to harmonize with μαινόλις γυνή. ἀτ]ης is plausible. For φαίνω in this context, cf. υ 308f. μή τίς μοι ἀεικείας...φαινέτω.

μαινόλις γυνή: cf. fr. 206 μισητὴ γυνή.

μαινόλις: Cf. μαινόλης, Sapph. fr. 1,18; φαινόλις, *Hy. Dem.* 51. Cf. Risch, 223f.

γυνή: Contradicts παρθένος (4).

21 ἐς] κόρακας ἄπεχε: Cf. Ar. *Pax* 1221 ἀπόφερ' ἐς κόρακας; Macar. II 24 = II 146 Leutsch-Schneidewin ἄπαγ' ἐς κόρακας; Ar. *Nub.* 133 (etc.) βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας. The expressions all appear to be transitive, though an object is never expressed. Schol. Ar. *Plut.* 394 wrongly implies that the expression ἐς κόρακας is Attic; cf. Theogn. 833 ἐν κοράκεσσι καὶ ἐν φθόρωι.

κόρακας: The irregular length of the final syllable serves to underline the emotion. A word-final -ς preceded by a short vowel may produce a long syllable (regularly in choral lyric, but also in Theogn. 2; 329).

τοῦτο: The only case of *scriptio plena* in the papyrus; as the following ε is certain, we have to accept it. The traces after ε are very uncertain. After ε, φ likely (its upper end can be seen between ςγ in the line above); then ε likely (neither ο nor ι possible); then a trace which I cannot explain; next what looks like a horizontal bar with some dots under it (τ

possible); then α not improbable, two dubious dots to its right may belong to it (but αι not excluded); finally one upright and some more ink, perhaps best explained as ν, but η not excluded. Both ἐφεσταίη [and ἐφεῖτ' αν[possible, but the latter perhaps to be preferred from a palaeographical point of view. Semantically, ἐφεσταίη is slightly more satisfactory. ἐφέστηκα, said of disasters, may mean both 'to be at hand' (M 326 κῆρες ἐφεστᾶσιν θανάτοιο) and 'to have occurred' (S. *Tr.* 1170 μόχθων τῶν ἐφεστώτων ἐμοί); here the former is suitable (supplemented with ποτε or κακόν). For ἐφεῖτ', perhaps the most natural interpretation would be 'to send upon' (cf. Δ 396 etc. πότμον ἐφῆκεν; Α 445 κήδε' ἐφῆκεν) but this meaning does not seem to be found with the middle; we are then left with 'to command' (not 'to allow': ἐφίημι cannot be used of allowing things to happen, only of allowing persons to do something): in this sense, ἐφίεμαι is found regularly with a neutre pronoun, as here (Ω 300 οὐ μέν τοι τόδ' ἐφιεμένηι ἀπιθήσω; S. *OT* 766 πρὸς τί τοῦτ' ἐφίεσαι), but the context always shows that an order is given to somebody to do something, not for something to come about, as is required here. Besides, it is hard to think of a suitable supplement of αν[; ἄναξ θεῶν makes good sense but violates Wilamowitz' Bridge (cf. Appendix 2.3.3.).

22 ὅ]πως : explains τοῦτο as in Semon. fr. 7,81f. τοῦτο...βουλεύεται, ὅκως...ἔρξειεν; S. *OT* 1058f. οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο τοῦθ' ὅπως ἐγώ...οὐ φανῶ τοὐμὸν γένος; *Tr.* 455; I 523; Sol. fr. 13,38. Neither ἐφίεμαι nor ἐφίσταμαι is, to my knowledge, involved in a similar construction elsewhere.

23 γεί]τοσι χάρμ' ἔσομαι: Cf. Hes. *Op.* 701 μὴ γείτοσι χάρματα γήμηις; Semon. fr. 7,74; 110f.; χάρμα as part of the predicate, cf. Z 82; K 193; γέλως, Archil. fr. 172,4.

βουλο[: I doubt if βούλομαι (the meaning 'prefer' suggested by πολλόν) can be construed with a personal accusative; hence an infinitive is called for, cf. A 112f. πολὺ βούλομαι αὐτὴν οἴκοι ἔχειν. γαμεῖν may be too explicit; perhaps λαβεῖν ('to get for a wife', cf. Hdt. I 199,4; E. fr. 953,27; but there may be a *double entendre*, cf. λαβὼν in 29). βουλο[ίμην is possible, though ἄν is not omitted with this form in archaic epic or lyric.

24 ἄπιστος : 'Unreliable' (Γ 106) rather than 'unfaithful'; λ 456 οὐκέτι πιστὰ γυναιξίν.

διπλόη: Cf. *AP* X 95,1 ('Palladas') μισῶ τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν διπλοῦν πεφυκότα — Degani in Degani-Burzacchini aptly compares the woman of fr. 184.

25 μάλα: Not reinforcing the comparative, for which there are no good parallels (K 124 is highly dubious), but to be taken with ἡ δέ: in Ionic, μάλα is used with words denoting a change in the person referred to; cf. Hdt. I 134,3 οὗτοι δὲ καὶ τῶν ὁμούρων (sc. ἦρχον), οἱ δὲ μάλα ('and these in their turn') τῶν ἐχομένων; IV 68,4 καὶ μάλα ἄλλοι ('and others again'); I 181,3 ἕτερος μάλα. Cf. μάλ' αὖ(θις).

ὀξυτέρη: In Greek, the comparative is often used in the second member of a comparison of qualities, cf. Pl. *Tht.* 161de Πρωταγόρας μὲν σοφός..., ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀμαθέστεροι; Mimn. fr. 7,2 ἄλλος τίς σε κακῶς, ἄλλος ἄμεινον ἐρεῖ; Theogn. 558; Pi. *N.* 8,22. Hence one expects ὀξύς to denote here the opposite of οὐκ ἄπιστος οὔτε διπλόη, in other words, 'double-hearted'. However, the word does not have this or a related meaning elsewhere (at best, one could start from 'intelligent', cf. Phocyl. fr. 8,1 D.[3], and interpret it here as 'sly', but the problem is that ὀξύς is rarely, if at all, a negative qualification in this, or any, sense). ὀξύς is used as epithet of words like μένος, καρδίη (*Hy. Ares* 14; Theogn. 366; 1030; 'keen, fierce') and of persons (B 440; E. *Hrcl.* 289); Neoboule has a fierce, passionate nature. The adjective does not have a sexual connotation elsewhere, with the possible exception of Hermesian. fr. 7,96f. Λαΐδος ἠράσατο ὀξὺς 'Αρίστιππος.

ποιεῖται [A spot of ink to the right of α): φίλους is called for, as 19f. do not contain an unambiguous reference to Neoboule's promiscuity; in itself, δόλους is not unattractive, but there is no good parallel for the construction. Cf. ad 5; if φίλους is read at both places, there would again be a marked opposition here to the girl's words.

26f. A reference to the proverb ἡ κύων σπεύδουσα τυφλὰ τίκτει, Macar. V 32 = II 181, cf. I 381 Leutsch-Schneidewin; Ar. *Pax* 1079; Schol. *ad loc.*; Gal. 4,639. See B. Alster, Die Welt des Orients 10, 1979, 1-5 and J. N. Bremmer, ZPE 39, 1980, 28 for Middle-East parallels.

26 [δοιχ': Both δέ] and δεί] suit the space; δείδοικα is the phonologically correct form in Ionic, but δε- seems to have been introduced by analogy (Hippon. fr. 73,7 W. = Deg.; elegy has both, but δε- is preponderant, cf. West 1974, 88).

ὅπως μή: Cf. K.-G. II 396.

τυφλά: The object of τίκτω, if not a noun, is neutre, cf. Hdt. I 112,2.

ἀλιτήμερα: A variation of ἠλιτόμηνος which suits this context better. The word recurs Hsch. ω 167 Schm.; *EM* 428,10; and perhaps Hes. *Scut.* 91. Cf. S. M. Medaglia, BPEC 27, 1979, 41-46, who wants to read it in Call. fr. 529. The form is not necessarily psilotic: the initial aspiration in ἡμέρα is analogical and may be late.

27 ἐπειγόμενος: The echo of 2 rounds off the speaker's refusal of the girl's alternative in a context where 'hurry' is opposed to 'good counsel' (cf. ad 2).

τὼς ὥσπερ: Cf. 31; Alcm. 1,46 *PMG*. Gallavotti (Maia 30, 1975, 27-36) wishes to introduce the nexus by conjecture in various fragments of Archilochus, plausibly in fr. 42,1.

τεκ-; Usually, τέκω is supplied, interpreted as: 'I am afraid to give birth': since these words round off a description of Neoboule in which

each new item reveals a further stage in the speaker's past involvement with Neoboule, it is preferable at any rate to interpret as: 'I am afraid that I have given birth', and perhaps to supply τέκον (cf. Slings 1976, 286-288; J. Van Sickle, BASP 15, 1978, 171-173; *Studi* II n. 22). The underlying thought is: "I am afraid that I have, on account of my haste, compromised myself with Neoboule, so now that you offer her to me in case I am 'in haste', I shall certainly not accept her".

28-35 The syntactic structure of the narrative is not beyond doubt. The participles καλύψας and ἔχων (30) are not likely to belong with ἔκλινα (29), as δ[(29) strongly suggests δέ (and also because the accusative -μένην in 31, if connected with παρθένον in 28, yields a clumsy sentence). They must therefore belong either with ἐφηψάμην (32) or with a lost predicate to be supplied in 31. The former alternative entails τε in 34 to correspond with τε in 32 and thus one period from μαλθαχῆι (29) to the end of the poem, which is not a very attractive possibility (in iambus, τε/τε is found only Semon. fr. 7,44, connecting phrases, not sentences; cf. Denniston, 503). Therefore, the most likely structure is: predicate (ἐφώνευν); participle + predicate (λαβὼν ἔκλινα); three participles + predicate (to be supplied in 31); predicate (ἐφηψάμην) + subordinate clause or paratactic main clause (ἔφαινε); participle + predicate (ἀμφαφώμενος... ἀφῆκα). Note the climax in length and structure until the end of 31 (and two enjambments in 29f.) and the regularity after it (two two-line units).

28 τοσ]αῦτ' ἐφώνευν: Cf. ad 6 for the formula and the spelling.

παρθένον: The description of the sexual activities begins with this significant word: we are invited to think of her in contrast with Neoboule who is not a παρθένος (cf. 4 and 20) and who has lost her ἄνθος παρθενήϊον (18; cf. the following ἐν ἄνθε[σιν). Cf. ad 32 and 2-6.

ἐν ἄνθε[σιν: For the preposition, cf. Hdt. IX 16,1 κλῖναι...ἐν κλίνηι. A short reference to the meadow as the traditional place for sexual activities (from the Διὸς ἀπάτη onwards). Cf. Bremer 1975, 268-280, esp. 272f.; add Hes. *Th.* 279; Anacr. 346,1,4-9 *PMG* (and my note, ZPE 30, 1978, 38). An important parallel is Dioscorides V 2 G.-P. = *AP* V 55 ἄνθεσιν ἐν χλοεροῖς (cf. ad 10 and 35), where I do not think that the flowers are metaphorical (cf. my note on Pl. *Smp.* 196a8, Mnemos. IV 36, 1983, 418).

29 τηλ]εθάεσσι: Probably from τηλεθάεις, -εντος (a similar formation: εὐρώεσσα in 8), a variant of epic τηλεθόων (epithet of woods and trees, cf. *Hy. Dion.* 41 ἄνθεσι τηλεθάων). The short ᾰ (cf. γανάεις, εὐνάεις, χαιτάεσσα, v.l. for χαιτέεσσα Semon. fr. 7,57) is puzzling: one expects either ᾱ/η (Hom. ἠχήεις) or, specifically Ionic, ε (Archil. ἠχέεις, fr. 122,8). Cf. Ruijgh's explanation (Lampas 13, 1980, 422): ἠχέεις was felt to be deriv-

ed from ἠχέω, hence τηλεθάεις could be created from τηλεθάω (this does not account for εὐνάεις and χαιτάεσσα). -εσσι instead of -εσι is probably an epic termination (and the word is, of course, an epicism).

λαβὼν: belongs closely with ἔκλινα; παρθένον is construed ἀπὸ κοινοῦ; cf. ω 398 λαβὼν κύσε χεῖρα.

μαλθακῆι: Cf. Hes. *Op.* 537 χλαῖνάν τε μαλακήν; S. fr. 483,2 Radt μαλθακῆς χλαίνης.

.[: Either δ̣[or α̣[; since an object of καλύψας as well as a 'Head' of -μένην (31) is needed, δ̣[έ μιν is to be considered almost certain.

30 **χλαί]νηι καλύψας**: Not a sign of tenderness but of taking possession sexually. Cf. E. fr. 603,4 ὅταν δ' ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς χλαῖναν εὐγενοῦς πέσηις; S. fr. 483 Radt; Theoc. 19,18 Ζανός τοι θυγάτηρ ὑπὸ τὰν μίαν ἵκετο χλαῖναν (in the wedding-ceremony); Asclepiades I G.-P. = *AP* V 169; Hieronym. Rh. fr. 35 Wehrli; Longus III 24,2f. ἤδη ποτὲ καὶ γυμνοὶ συγκατεκλίνησαν καὶ ἓν δέρμα αἰγὸς ἐπεσύραντο. καὶ ἐγένετο ἂν γυνὴ Χλόη ῥαιδίως κτέ; purely symbolical S. *Tr.* 539f. δύ' οὖσαι (Deïaneira and Iole) μίμνομεν μιᾶς ὑπὸ χλαίνης ὑπαγκάλισμα. The narrator mentions only one of the two persons that lie under the χλαῖνα, cf. Petron. 11,2f. opertum *me* amiculo euoluit et Quid agebas inquit...uesticontubernium facis? The χλαῖνα is not a blanket, but the narrator's cloak, which is often employed as such, cf. Ω 646 where beds are covered with χλαῖναι; Pl. *Smp.* 219b, etc.

αὐχέν' ἀγκάλῃσ' ἔχων̣: Cf. E. *IT* 289f. μητέρ' ἀγκάλαις ἐμὴν ἔχουσα; Ξ 353; Theogn. 264f.; Archil. fr. 140,1 αὐ]χένα σχεθών. The plural is not necessarily poetical (so Calder, 42; Van Sickle 1980, 227f.): the arms first encircle the neck and do not start their activities until 32.

ἀγκάλῃσ': It is very unlikely that this is the old and rare dative plural termination -ησι; probably the iota was left out after η (cf. 12) and escaped the corrector.

ἔχων̣[: after ω, two dots of ink that can be interpreted as an upright.

31 The reading]μ̣ατι is not certain:]λ̣ is possible, though less likely than]μ̣ and the iota appears to have been cancelled as in 2 (-ατα?), though nothing was written above it. The letter after πα may be an υ, but the fibres between it and the letter under it (ὲ of χὲρσιν) are so twisted that I cannot decide whether ὲ accounts for all the ink; if not, the letter after πα has a long tail (ρ φ ϕ; not υ; φ and ϕ excluded because they do not fit the traces in other respects). Both παυ̣[σ]α̣μ̣ε̣ν̣ην and παρ̣[φ]α̣μ̣ε̣ν̣ην possible; [φ] accounts for the space better (there is a lot of blank space between υ̣ or ρ̣ and α̣); after [.], omikron excluded. I see no acceptable construction for παυσαμένην: if no predicate is supplied after νεβρ̣[, a genitive is necessary, but even παυσαμένην...φυγῆς (the best suggestion) is intolerably clumsy: "in (from)...(-ματι), stopping as a fawn stops fleeing" (if -ματα is read, the problem becomes, if anything, more complicated).

This and the resulting unwieldy period induce me to prefer παρφαμένην, 'trying to persuade me'. The word may be used of making a hostile person change his mind (Ω 771 ἀλλὰ σὺ τόν γ' ἐπέεσσι παραιφάμενος κατέρυκες; Hes. *Th.* 90—here, too, the accusative is lacking; *Hy. Dem.* 336); it is not found elsewhere in iambus or elegy. For the apocope, cf. fr. 5,2; 134. If this suggestion is right, the girl is not an active partner (I had argued against that interpretation 1980, 324); nor can the following predicate be something like 'I calmed her', because this would leave τὼς ὥστε νεβρ[completely in the air. What we need is "I caught her like a fawn" (this would also give a good explanation of τε in 32, as 'I caught' and ἐφηψάμην are semantically related actions); besides, the verb should probably be an aorist (after ἐφώνευν, all the narrator's actions are in that tense): νεβρ[ὸν εἰλόμην or perhaps νεβρ[ίον λάβον (cf. Λ 113f. λέων ἐλάφοιο...τέκνα...λαβών). For omission of the syllabic augment (cf. ad 6 and 27) see fr. 192 (dactylic part of epode); fr. 219 (iambic trimeter; χραίσμησε is a variation of Homeric ἔχραισμε); fr. 5,2 (elegy); fr. 98,9 (cf. Peek, ZPE 59, 1985, 22) κεῖτο (trochaic tetrameter). νεβρίον (this is probably the correct accent) is attested Sapph. fr. 58,16. For the first word of the line, something like 'entreaty', 'appeal' seems best suited (either in the dative, the middle of παράφημι always being accompanied by ἐπέεσσι in epic Greek, or an internal accusative, cf. Pi. *P.* 9,43 παρφάμεν τοῦτον λόγον): perhaps εὔγ]ματι (-τα), cf. χ 249; A. *Th.* 247; the word is not found in the singular. For παλλομένην, which cannot be read, see my note 1980, 323.

τὼς: Grave accent certain; there is also what might be an acute, though I rather think it an accidental sweep.

ὥστε νεβρ[(not νέβρ[): An image of fear (in the *Iliad* of cowardice: Δ 243; Φ 29; Χ 1); cf. Anacr. 408 *PMG* ἀγανῶς οἷά τε νεβρὸν νεοθηλέα γαλαθηνὸν ὅς τ' ἐν ὕλῃ κεροέσσης ἀπολειφθεὶς ἀπὸ μητρὸς ἐπτοήθη (probably of a frightened girl; with ἀγανῶς, cf. ἠπίως in the next line); perhaps Sapph. fr. 213Ab2 V.; of a sexual prey (probably) Theogn. 949; 1278c; Horat. *Carm.* I 23,1-4. Cf. fr. 280 (πρόξ used of a coward); fr. 7b (ἔλαφος ditto; cf. Peek as quoted above, 14f.).

32]ων: The supplement chosen here is crucial to our understanding of the rest of the narrative and therefore of the entire poem.

Hypothesis A: Supply μαζῶν. The narrator seizes the girl's breasts (in the act, the pins that hold together her peplos get unstuck), so that her body becomes visible; touching it all over he reaches ejaculation.

Hypothesis B: Supply μηρῶν. (He uncovers the girl and) takes hold of her thighs (and opens them), so that her pubic hair (?) becomes visible; (he then insinuates himself between her legs and) starts caressing her whole body, etcetera.

To my mind, the first hypothesis is clearly superior. There is a good

climax from embrace, via clasping (not touching) the breasts to ejaculation in the lower erogenous zone (a 'descending crescendo', Van Sickle 1980, 226). The 'fresh skin' (νέον χρόα) comes in at the right moment, between clasping the breasts and caressing the whole body.

Hypothesis B requires supplying too many actions that are not hinted at; besides, "I grasped her thighs" suggests a rather detailed description that stops short before it has really started: the narrator does not tell how ejaculation is reached (cf. ad 35). The phrase νέον...χρόα is very hard to interpret along these lines; again, it focuses on what is at the best a less important detail, thereby adding to the incongruence between 32f. and the succinct reference to orgasm. Matters are only made worse when μηρῶν is interpreted as 'buttocks' (A. Aloni, ZPE 40, 1980, 33-35; id., *Le Muse di Archiloco*, Copenhagen 1981, 130f.): 33 becomes wholly opaque. What is more, in the parallel Eub. fr. 130 K. it is clear from the context that μηρός is used euphemistically (τὴν κέρχον, παιδερασταῖς); there are no comparable signals in our text that the word is to be taken in that way.

I do not take much stock in the parallels from literature (and archaeology) that have been adduced in favour of one interpretation or the other. All the places where touching (grasping) breasts is mentioned as part of erotic play (cf. Degani-Burzacchini; D. A. Gerber, Arethusa 11, 1978, 206) do not in themselves disprove μηρῶν (and vice versa).

χερσὶν...ἐφηψάμην: Cf. ε 348 χείρεσσιν ἐφάψεαι; Theogn. 6; *AP* VII 647,2 (Simias). The verb means 'to take hold of', not 'to touch'.

χ̣ὲρσιν: For the accent, cf. 3 ἥμετερου (error for ἡμὲτερου?) and ad 10 παρεξ. See also *A*, Introduction.

ἠπίως: Not 'tenderly' (caressing) but 'gently, soothingly' (cf. Anacr. *l.c.* ἀγανῶς). Having subdued the girl by his preceding gestures (covering and embracing), the man can now proceed with stages of the play that require, if not cooperation (cf. ad 33), at any rate resignation. The word in itself disproves the suggestion of rape (cf. ad 35). Normally it is used of addressing or treating kindly, not of a concrete gesture, but cf. E. *IA* 601 ἀγανῶς δὲ χεροῖν; Pi. *P.* 2,8 ἀγαναῖσιν ἐν χερσὶ...ἐδάμασσε πώλους.

33 **]..ἐφαι̣ν̣ε, η over αι**: To the left of ἐ, there are traces of ink on bent (and partly detached) fibres. At letter-top height a narrow horizontal stroke and a somewhat larger one above it; ρ possible; traces to its left defy interpretation. The action of ἐφαινε (ἐφηνε) is not necessarily intentional; the simplex verb may denote something becoming visible more or less automatically, as a consequence of another action; cf. σ 67 ζώσατο μὲν ῥάκεσιν περὶ μήδεα, φαῖνε δὲ μηρούς (cf. 74). The girl is not necessarily an active partner in the love play. If it is assumed that the girl's whole body is bared by the action of grasping the breasts (cf. previous note; it would

appear to be the whole body that is caressed in the next line), ἡ δ'] ἄρ' is plausible (there may just possibly be a trace of an apostrophos after ρ); cf. fr. 185,5 τῶι δ' ἄρ'; Denniston, 33-35. On the other hand, it is possible that νέον...χρόα refers to the girl's breasts (cf. below); if so, ἧιπερ suggests itself (παρέφηνε suggests an activity on the girl's part that is out of keeping with the rest of the narrative). The choice between imperfect and aorist is difficult (cf. σ 67 for the imperfect—followed by φάνεν δέ οἱ εὐρέες ὦμοι, and preceded by ζώσατο). All other predicates here are in the aorist, but the imperfect may be defended as leading up to ἀμφαφώμενος; ἔφηνε in 20 cannot be used as an argument. Cf. the introduction.

νέον ἥβης ἐπήλυσιν χρόα[(a cancelled ι[—cf. 2 and 31—is possible): Probably an inserted apposition as A. *Eum.* 302 ἀναίματον, βόσχημα δαιμόνων, σκίαν (cf. *Ag.* 119). ἐπήλυσις (not elsewhere attested before Call. fr. 331,1, but ἐξήλυσις is found in Hdt.) elsewhere means 'approach', and 'the fresh skin, the approach of her prime' perhaps implies that the girl's breasts are not yet fully grown. On the other hand, the meaning of ἐπηλυσίη (*Hy. Dem.* 228 etc.), 'bewitching, spell, charm', makes equally good sense; cf. Burzacchini, who adduces Hsch. ε 4557 Latte ἐπήλυσις· ἔφοδος, ἐπαγωγή (spell); the second interpretation is perhaps derived from a commentary on this passage. Cf. also *Suppl. Hell.* 962,8 (in an erotic context) τέκμαρ ἐπηλυσίης. Note that ἤλυσις is an analogical formation, based on ἠλυσία (not derived from *ἤλυθ-τις which would yield *ἤλυστις). Cf. Casanova, 20.

Other explanations are far less likely. I cannot think of any supplement at the beginning of the line which would make it possible to take ἐπήλυσιν as the dative plural of ἔπηλυς and to construe it with χερσίν. I doubt if it is possible to interpret νέον χρόα as an accusative of respect 'the arrival of pubescence on her young skin' (pubic hair) and χροΐ is no improvement (as it would require taking νέον as adverb, 'only just').

34 If ἡ δ' ἄρ' is read in 33, ἐγὼ δ]ὲ is obvious here; ἅπαν τε (δὲ) is superfluous because of ἀμφ-.

σῶμα καλὸν: The phrase suggests the girl's passivity (though σῶμα is, of course, used here in its post-Homeric sense, cf. Slings 1975). Cf. adesp. epic. 1,1 (p. 71) Powell καλὸν σῶμα.

ἀμφαφώμενος: Typically epic, found with a human object τ 475 πρὶν πάντα ἄνακτ' ἐμὸν ἀμφαφάασθαι (one must not use this parallel as a support for ἅπαν).

35]ον ἀφῆκα μένος: μένος ἀφίημι is a formular phrase of unclear meaning in the *Iliad* (N 444 etc.); here either 'I lost my strength' (as a consequence of orgasm) or specifically 'I ejected the semen' (for ἀφίημι, cf. Arist. *HA* 489a9; *GA* 717b12). Cf. Dioscorides V 7 G.-P. = *AP* V 55 μέχρις ἀπεσπείσθη λευκὸν μένος ἀμφοτέροισι; hence the supplement

λευκ]ὸν (cf. Hes. *Th.* 190f. λευκὸς ἀφρός; S. *Ai.* 1412f. μέλαν μένος = blood), which yields an attractive binary structure for the whole line: adjective (colour) + verb + noun (iambic). West protests (1975, 217): Archilochus could not "have used μένος in this concrete sense, and so graphic a reference to the physical semen is out of keeping with the style of the song", but there is, to my mind, little appreciable difference between ποη[κήπους and λευκὸν μένος (and if Sophocles can use μένος for blood, Archilochus may have used it for semen). However graphic, λευκὸν μένος is still on a par with τυφλὰς ἐγχέλυς of the epodes (fr. 189), not with σάθη of the iambic poems (fr. 25,3; 43,1; 82,4).

ξανθῆς ἐπιψαυ[: We have to decide between κόμης and a word that denotes pubic hair. At first sight, it is not clear how the former is to be reconciled with ἀμφαφώμενος, and why the girl's hair is so important that it closes the poem (cf. Van Sickle 1976, 145, who speaks of a 'pat on the head'—this would indeed be a disgusting anticlimax). But if we suppose that the girl had very long hair, both difficulties are dispensed with: the narrator could fondle her whole body and thereby her hair; this was sexually exciting, the more so because it was blond (*i.e.* not black; an exception and therefore an attraction in Greek women).

Beautiful hair is, in Greek literature, one of the most important aspects of physical attractiveness (cf. for example Semonides' description of the beautiful woman, fr. 7,57-70: the word χαιτέεσσ' is found in the first line and two lines (65f.) are dedicated to her thick hair), and Aphrodite is called χρυσῆ for this reason. Archilochus' interest in it appears from fr. 31 ἡ δέ οἱ κόμη ὤμους κατεσκίαζε καὶ μετάφρενα. It is possible that this fragment was in fact quoted from this epode; if so, we must assume that Synesius, who quotes it with the words ἐπαινεῖ μὲν (sc. τὴν κόμην) οὖσαν ἐν ἑταίρας σώματι, λέγει δὲ οὕτως, used ἑταίρα in the sense of 'companion' not of 'courtesan' (this is not unlikely, as we do not expect courtesans in seventh-century Paros; of course, the word may have been used as a euphemism for 'prostitute'). Cf. also fr. 48,5.

For ξανθὴ κόμη, cf. A 197; *Hy. Dem.* 279; Theogn. 828; Sapph. fr. 98a6f.; Alcm. 3,9 *PMG*; B. 9,24. ξανθῆς...τριχός may, of course, refer to the hair on the head, but precisely because of its ambiguity this is far less likely; besides, the collective singular θρίξ is not found before Aeschylus (one dubious occurrence in Pindar, fr. 140a15).

Alternatively, the second half of the line might be interpreted as 'touching (with my penis) her pubic hair' (perhaps ἐπιψαύ[σας is preferable on this assumption). This would have the advantage that the narrator keeps his promise to 'land on the grassy meadows' but it remains to be seen if it is really an advantage (there is no certainty that the girl's virginity has been left unharmed). Besides, the added detail that the pubic hair is blond makes no sense.

It is therefore better to assume that no information at all is provided as to how the narrator's orgasm is reached, and the endless speculations on this problem are futile. It is bad psychology as well as bad method to infer from σχήσω...κήπους that full coitus is indeed avoided (so rightly Casanova 19; 21f.), and it is equally useless to claim the opposite. We do not know and we are not meant to know. I have suggested elsewhere (1980, 330-334; *Studi* II; III) that the interpretation of this poem should start precisely with this uncertainty.

APPENDIX

METRE

1.1 *The epodic structure*

× – ∪ – × – ∪ – × – ∪ –// 3 ia //
– ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – // × – ∪ – × – ∪ – /// D // 2 ia ///

Iambic trimeter followed by what was called in Antiquity the 'third Archilochean asynartete' (Hephaestion, 15,9 = 50,14-17 Consbr.): hemiepes plus iambic dimeter. This epodic scheme was imitated by Horace, *Epode* 11:

Petti, nihil me sicut antea iuuat
scribere uersiculos amore percussum graui.

Horace's second line looks like a reflex of the fragment (fr. 196) quoted by Hephaestion as an example of the third asynartete:

ἀλλά μ' ὁ λυσιμελὴς ὦταῖρε δάμναται πόθος,

which is certainly the second line of an epode (Hephaestion always gives the first or second line of an epode as examples); it probably was the second line of our poem. (There are two more examples of the asynartete in Cratinus' *Archilochoi*; cf. Degani 1977, 34f. n. 47.)

The suggestion that fr. 215 καί μ' οὔτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει preceded or followed fr. 196—though attractive at first sight because of the Horatian *nihil me (...) iuuat / scribere uersiculos*—breaks down on Tzetzes' testimony that fr. 215 is from a poem on the drowning of Archilochus' brother-in-law (cf. Longin. 10,7; Archil. fr. 8-13; West 1977, 44-46; Degani 1977, 34-36).

Other fragments that may conceivably belong to the First Cologne Epode are:

38 οἵην Λυκάμβεω παῖδα τὴν ὑπερτέρην

"alone, the younger daughter of Lycambes" (this could have been part of the initial narrative) and

224 πτώσσουσαν ὥστε πέρδικα
(dimeter or trimeter; just possibly a description of the girl—if so, the line should be placed near 38; cf. *Studi* I 15). On fr. 31, cf. ad 35.

1.2. *The problem of the asynartete*

The amazing feature of this metrical structure is the fact that between hemiepes and dimeter there is *brevis in longo* (1—digamma never makes position in Archilochus—; 7; 21; 33) and *hiatus* (3; 17); the combination of these phenomena is called *pausa* since August Boeckh (it is not, as far as we know, recognized in ancient metrical theories). There is also *pausa* (as was to be expected) after the trimeter and the dimeter.

Hitherto the *communis opinio* about Archilochus' asynartetes used to be that there was word-boundary only, not *pausa*, between the constituent parts. *Pausa* is also observed within Horace's asynartetes (from *Epode* 11: 14 *feruidiore mero arcana promorat loco* (cf. 24); 10 *arguit et latere petitus imo spiritus* (cf. 6; 26)—see further *Epode* 13,8; 10; 14).

Using the traditional (but not ancient) definition of the asynartete, Gelzer (1975, 19f.) argues that the author of this poem followed a metrical theory which was also responsible for Horace's practice; this theory allowed *brevis in longo* and *hiatus* between the two cola. As a parallel, Horace's Sapphic stanza is quoted; here the dicolic third line of the Lesbian poets (Sapphic hendecasyllabus + adonius - *hiatus* between these is excluded) is now split up into two lines, between which there is full *pausa*.

This theory is placed late in the Hellenistic period by Gelzer, presumably because there is no reference to *pausa* in asynartetes in Hephaestion, and because there is no *pausa* in the asynartetes of Archilochus' third-century imitators (*l.c.*, n. 24; all his examples, however, are of the 'first asynartete', 4 da / ith, except Phalaecus IV 3 and 7 G.-P. = *AP* XIII 27, which are plain dactylic hexameters. Now this particular asynartete is a special case because of the double-short ending of its first colon—cf. *C*, Introduction—; even Horace (*Carm.* I 4) refrains from *hiatus* and *brevis in longo* here).

Kannicht tries to undermine Gelzer's position by identifying this Hellenistic metrical theory with the practice of the Alexandrian editors, who wrongly conflated hemiepes and iambic dimeter into one στίχος. Their colometry (which it is claimed did not take into account *hiatus* and *brevis in longo*) determined both later Greek theorists like Hephaestion and the Roman imitator Horace (Gelzer's parallel, the Sapphic stanza, is similarly explained: the colometry of Alexandrian editors made it into a four-line strophe, which is why Horace allows *hiatus* between the last two lines).

Not all of this is quite to the point. It is true that Hephaestion and other theoreticians do not pay attention to the two phenomena which indicate *pausa* (Gelzer 1975, 20 n. 24, wrongly suggests the contrary), but to state that Alexandrian colometry disregarded these as well in all cases is to beg the question, since it is not established that the colometry of this papyrus is Alexandrian. More importantly, if Horace's versification was indeed based on Alexandrian colometry, we should not expect *hiatus* and *brevis in longo* to occur within what is presented as one line. As they do occur, we should either follow Gelzer or assume that Horace admitted *hiatus* and *brevis in longo* between hemiepes and iambic dimeter because he had found the same phenomena in Archilochus, some of whose metrical structures he was the first to imitate in Latin (*Epist.* I 19, 23-25 *Parios ego primus iambos / ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus / Archilochi*, sc. in the *Epodes*); this is the stand taken by Rossi (1976, 211-213; 219; 1978, 36-38).

The case can hardly be settled through reference to other 'asynartetic' dicola in Archilochus, because apart from fr. 196 we have no asynartetes in which the first colon is blunt, not pendant. (Of the asynartete iambic dimeter + hemiepes, attested for Archilochus by the Latin grammarian Diomedes (= fr. 199), no examples have turned up yet, while fr. 322 is spurious). Asynartetes such as enhoplion ('erasmonideum') + ithyphallic (fr. 168-171) and acatalectic dactylic tetrameter + ithyphallic (Second Cologne Epode, cf. *C*) do not help much unless there is *hiatus* between the cola, which there is not (but one is scarcely allowed to judge on the basis of eight lines in all) or unless one accepts Hephaestion's statement that at the end of the dactylic tetrameter, – ⏑ ⏑ and – ⏑ – occur side by side (cf. *C*, Introduction).

Among contemporary poems there is one plausible parallel in the dicolon 'lecythion' (catalectic trochaic dimeter) + enhoplion (acephalous hipponactean) which is found four times in a row in the strophes of Alcman's Louvre *Partheneion* (1 *PMG*); this pair of cola was plausibly baptized an asynartete by Wilamowitz (*Griechische Verskunst*, Berlin 1921, 421; cf. 383). Here too, after the lecythion there is *brevis in longo* (36; 78; 98) and *hiatus* (38; 56; 70; 80)—of course there is also *pausa* after the enhoplion. The absence of *pausa* in the so-called 'encomiologicum' (or 'elegiambus': hemiepes + × – ⏑ – –; for occurrences cf. Rossi 1976, 225f.) is no counter-evidence, since × – ⏑ – – is not a colon in its own right (though the encomiologicum is also classed with the asynartetes by Hephaestion, 15,10 = 50,18 - 51,2 Consbr.).

An objection to this parallel is its colometry: in the papyrus of the *Partheneion*, lecythion and enhoplion are written as separate cola; in the Cologne papyrus, hemiepes and iambic dimeter are joined together to make

one line. The theory that epodes were always formed of *pairs* of στίχοι may have contributed to this conflation—even the metrical pattern of Callimachus *Epigr.* 39 Pf. = xix G.-P. 2 iaΛ // 2 iaΛ // 4 da / ith ///, with *brevis in longo* between the two dimeters, is treated by Hephaestion (15, 24 = 55,13-18 Consbr.) as consisting of *two* lines. The practice of Cercidas, who is the only Hellenistic poet to write longer poems in asynartetes, and who avoids *pausa* throughout, may have been an additional factor; cf. also Call. fr. 227 treated below, 2.3.2. (For a complete list of Greek asynartetes and epodes, cf. Rossi 1976, 223-229 = 1978, after 48).

Against Gelzer's thesis, it should further be noted that the opposition of asynartete (a/b) and epode (a//b) is a modern theory, based on very scanty material. When a new text comes to light in which the theory is contradicted, it is *a priori* more likely that the theory is wrong than that the poem is a fraud. In all fairness, it should be added that the new Archilochus also contradicts an ancient theory, which says that epodes are always distichs, not tristichs. It was already known that this theory did not tally with Hellenistic practice (cf. Call. *Epigr.* 39 referred to above; Theoc. *Epigr.* 21 4 da / ith// 3 ia // 3 iaΛ ///, etc.—it may be noted in passing that the σκώμματα passus of Ar. *Ran.* 416-439, 2 iaΛ // 2 iaΛ // 3 ia ///, is, to all practical purposes, a fifth-century tristichic epode) or with that of Horace (*Epode* 11; 13); the most logical conclusion is that the ancient theory, as well as the modern one, is false. We must accept that Archilochus wrote at least one epode consisting of three-line stanzas. If syntactical incisions are anything to go by, they suggest that the *pausa* after the hemiepes is at least equal in status to those after dimeter and trimeter: there is sentence-end 10 times after the hemiepes, 8 to 10 times after the dimeter (17 and 33 are uncertain), 5 times after the trimeter, and 6 or 7 times (21 is uncertain) within a colon.

All this destroys the case for at least one asynartete to be considered *one* line and, generally speaking, it seriously upsets our modern conception of the asynartete as a line consisting of two cola separated by word-end *but not by pausa.* Rossi's introduction of the concept 'diaeresis with licence', a place where there is *hiatus* and *brevis in longo*, but which is not *pausa* (1976, 215; 1978, 41) restates the problem rather than solving it. Quite possibly, this new find will eventually cause the whole notion of asynartete to be abandoned altogether for archaic iambus.

2. *Word-boundaries and bridges*

2.1. In the following remarks, 'word-end' is to be understood as: the end of a prosodic unit, formed by one mobile word which may be fol-

lowed by one or more postpositives (δοκέω + δέ + μιν) and may be preceded by one or more prepositives (ὅπως + μὴ + τυφλὰ). This is common knowledge, though scholars do not always act upon it (West 1974, 113 overlooks that in 24 οὔτε διπλόη, there is no word-end after οὔτε). In addition, it must be stipulated that a prepositive followed by a postpositive is not a prosodic unit of its own, since it cannot close a sentence, but constitutes one with the following unit (ὥς + με + κέλεαι). This rule explains some apparent infractions of word-end rules (e.g. 2 καί σε θυμὸς is one unit; καί σε θυμὸς ἰθύει is no violation of Knox' bridge, cf. 2.2.4., which forbids / – ⏒ / – ⏑ – //). For a further modification, cf. 2.2.4.

With the following, cf. A. M. Devine-L. D. Stephens, GRBS 22, 1981, 305-321; M. van Raalte, *Rhythm and metre*, Assen 1986, 186-191; 248-258.

2.2. *Iambic trimeter*

2.2.1. Word-end after the third longum ('median diaeresis') is found twice: 6 (τὴν δ') and 8 (γῇ). In either case, the word is monosyllabic, as always in Archilochus (fr. 23,16; 24,12; 25,6; 175,4; 176,3; 205). Normally (but not invariably, cf. *Studi* I, n. 67) the monosyllable is, syntactically speaking, connected with the second, not the first half of the line.

2.2.2. Word-end after the third anceps, if a long syllable ('Porson's Law'), is strictly forbidden; the iambographers do not admit long monosyllables or elision to circumvent this rule, as the tragedians do.

2.2.3. Simultaneous word-end after the fourth and fifth *longa* is forbidden (no × – ⏑ – × – ⏑ – / × – / ⏑ – //; 'Wilamowitz' bridge', sometimes called 'Knox' first bridge'). This rule is not influenced either by the quantity of the third *anceps* or by other word-ends in the same line (wrongly West 1974, 113 'unless a monosyllable precedes', but all relevant monosyllables are prepositives, cf. fr. 23,13; 15—cf. ZPE 45, 1982, 69f.—; 24,1; 42,1; 175,2; 187, while fr. 44 and 29,7 the first iambic word is itself a prepositive). The rule seems to apply to Archilochus' trochaic tetrameters as well.

2.2.4. Simultaneous word-end after the second *breve* and the third *anceps* is forbidden (no × – ⏑ – × – ⏑ / – ⏒ / – ⏑ – //; 'Knox' bridge' or 'Knox' second bridge'). 2 καί + σε + θυμὸς ἰθύει has been accounted for (cf. 2.1.), and similarly 10 τῶν + τις + ἀρκέσει if τῶν is a relative (and perhaps also if it is a demonstrative, cf. below). In the exceptions listed by West (1974, 113), some disyllabics are prepositive (fr. 23,9; 26,6 and cf. 41,1; perhaps 219), one is enclitic (fr. 24,10), one a combination of prepositive and postpositive (fr. 26,5 τοὺς + μὲν + αἰτίους). Four exceptions remain:

fr. 25,5 ἀλλ' ἐγὼ‿εἶπέ σοι
54,5 ἤδε δ' ἄζ[⏑ –
177,3 σοὶ δὲ θηρίων
181,12 σὸς δὲ θυμὸς ἔλπεται

It cannot be a coincidence that in all cases a pronoun is involved: maybe Archilochus treated all short pronouns as prepositives (this would account also for Semon. fr. 1,4 οὐδὲν εἰδότες; Hippon. fr. 78,14 W. = Deg. τόνδε ῥῖνα φοινίξας; Anan. 1,4 καὶ σὲ πολλὸν ἀνθρώπων; of West's list, only Hippon. fr. 14,2 W. = 22,2 Deg. and 36,2 W. = 44,2 Deg. are real infractions).

Again, the rule is valid also for Archilochus' tetrameters (fr. 106,5 μηδὲ + τοῦτον (+) ἐμβάλῃς is no exception).

2.2.5. A mobile monosyllable at the end of the line is found only fr. 184,2 θἠτέρῃ δὲ πῦρ, with special emphasis; otherwise it is probably avoided.

2.3. *Iambic dimeter*

The publication of the Cologne papyrus enables us to make tentative statements about bridges in the dimeter. In addition to the 18 dimeters of this poem, we have 21 specimens in Archilochus (fr. 172,2; 4; 173,1; 174,1; 175,1; 3; 5; 7; 9; 176,2; 177,2; 4; 178; 181,5; 7; 9; 11; 193,1; 3; 194; 329—cf. *Studi* I 13 and n. 204), 3 in Hipponax (*D* I 2; 4; II 7) and 1 adespoton (ad.ia. 57). Besides, there are two poems by Callimachus (fr. 195 choliamb // 2 ia ///; fr. 227 2 ia / ith ///) to check our conclusions (from Archilochus, I leave out of account fr. 174,3; 180; 181,1; 3; 202; 223-226; 322,1).

2.3.1. Discounting this papyrus, 13; fr. 175,5; 7; 9; 181,5; 7; 9, there is one case of median diaeresis (fr. 193,3) in 39 lines from the iambographers. It is not found in Callimachus' dimeters. Though not entirely avoided, it would seem that splitting the line into two equal halves is not popular with these poets (Aristophanes does so quite frequently, cf. *Vesp*. 251; 253; 256 etc.). Is it a coincidence that the one exception in iambus is the line πεπαρμένος δι' ὀστέων?

2.3.2. It is sometimes asked whether Porson's law applies to the iambic dimeter. There is no infraction in 35 instances (not taking into account this papyrus, 1; 11; 13; 19; 31; fr. 175,9; 181,5; 7); it may be noted that there is one in the spurious fr. 322 and in fr. 180 which is often supposed to be a dimeter, though on uncertain grounds (cf. *Studi* I 10). Callimachus' practice is variable: in fr. 195 there are no violations in 15 dimeters, but in fr. 227 four out of five dimeters have word-end after long second *anceps*. Presumably the conception of fr. 195 as a distichic epode

(with iambic dimeter as a line in its own right) as against fr. 227 as a stichic asynartete (no *pausa* after the iambic dimeter, which is only a colon) is crucial in his practice. There are a number of violations in the tragedians (listed by Parker, CQ 16, 1966, 14-16) and, as was to be expected, many in Aristophanes (cf. *Vesp.* 254; 255 etc.).

When we compare the figures for the archaic dimeter (no violation of Porson's Law in 35 lines) with those for the comic trimeter (one violation in every fifth line), it may confidently be assumed that the iambographers rigidly observed Porson's Law in dimeter and trimeter alike. It is the safest policy not to accept supplements in the dimeters of this poem that do not respect this bridge, cf. Merkelbach—West, 105 (I have not omitted such supplements from the apparatus, but do not discuss them in the commentary).

2.3.3. Wilamowitz' bridge is never violated in 37 certain cases (excluding this papyrus 13; 21; fr. 175,7; 181,5; 7; 9); this is of course a consequence of the tendency observed 2.3.1. Again, Callimachus follows suit. Examples in Aristophanes are not very numerous (e.g. *Lys.* 262f.). It is hard to interpret these facts, but I am inclined to believe, considering the relative frequency of × – /⏑ – × – /⏑ – //, that Archilochus should not be credited with μὴ τοῦτ' ἐφεῖτ' ἄναξ θεῶν (cf. ad 21) or ἄκουε δὴ κακοῦ λόγου (cf. *Studi* I 17).

2.3.4. In 38 dimeters (neglecting this papyrus 1; 13; 19; fr. 175,9; 181,7) there is no violation of Knox' bridge, provided the conditions set out 2.1. and 2.2.4. are applied (thus, 31 ὥστε + νεβρὸν – ⏑ –; fr. 194 ἐν + δὲ + βακχίῃ). As this zeugma is essentially a refinement of Porson's Law, we should probably expect it to be observed in dimeter and trimeter alike. Again, there are no examples in Call. fr. 195 (and we should not look for any in poetry that does not respect Porson's Law). I think this is a regular taboo of the iambographers' dimeter, but the question is of little practical importance.

2.3.5. Mobile monosyllables at line-end are not attested.

2.4. *Hemiepes*

If there are special rules concerning word-end within the hemiepes, our material is too scanty to discover them (the pentameter is a different case because its halves are not separated by *pausa*); but given the variability of word-boundaries within the first three feet of the hexameter one should not expect any rules to obtain. There are no monosyllabic mobile words at beginning or end of the hemiepes in this poem. Cf. also 2.2.5.; 2.3.5.; 2.5.3.

2.5. *Contrastive use of word-boundaries*

In the last two hemiepe and dimeters (33 and 35), there is a striking harmony of the word-boundaries:

– ⏑ / ⏑ – ⏑ / ⏑ – // x̄ – / ⏑ – x – / ⏑ – ///

Such a 'responsion', towards the end of the poem, can hardly be a coincidence, the less so as there is also an internal responsion: in either line, both the hemiepes and the dimeter starts and ends with a disyllabic word.

Observations like this one soon lead to total subjectivity if interpreted in terms of poetic effect; what follows is submitted with some hesitation.

2.5.1. All trimeters in this poem have word-end after the second *anceps*, except the successive lines 18; 20; 22; 24, which have word-end after the second *breve* instead. Line 16 has both and so perhaps has 26 (it is not quite certain if ὅπως + μή is one unit with the following τυφλά). In 16, the Neoboule passus is announced, in 26 it is concluded.

2.5.2. Within the trimeter, simultaneous word-end after second *anceps* and fourth *longum* (x – ⏑ – x / – ⏑ – / x – ⏑ – //) seems to underline the cretic word (cf. Korzeniewski, 47):

4 καλὴ τέρεινα	παρθένος·	δοκέω δέ μιν
28 τοσαῦτ' ἐφώνευν·	παρθένον δ'	ἐν ἄνθεσιν

cf. 12 σὺν θεῷ; 32 ἠπίως. But I see no special emphasis in 14 καὶ πυλέων.

2.5.3. Every hemiepes beginning with a disyllabic word is followed by a dimeter ending in a disyllabic word (certain: 3; 5; 11; 27; 33; 35; fr. 196; probable: 1; 17; cf. 25). This is a generalization of the remark made above on 33 and 35—it may be a coincidence, because Archilochus likes to end his dimeter with a disyllabic word anyway (23 out of 32 verifiable instances).

2.5.4. All occurrences of πολύς are the first word of an iambic dimeter (9; 13; 23; 25); the majority of demonstrative pronouns and adverbs open a dimeter (5; 19; 21; 27; 31), trimeter (6; 28) or hemiepes (11).

2.5.5. Enjambment at the transition from dimeter to trimeter (end of stanza) is found in 8 (γυναικός could have been omitted; one may ask whether this is really enjambment); 16 (κήπους); 30 (χλαίνηι). Enjambments within the stanzas are less forceful (29 τηλεθάεσσι and ἔκλινα, preceding 30).

3. *Metre and diction*

When dactylic and iambo-trochaic metres are contrasted within an epode, it may sometimes be observed that the dactylic parts have a more lofty tone, for example:

(fr. 168) Ἐρασμονίδη Χαρίλαε, χρῆμά τοι γελοῖον
ἐρέω πολὺ φίλταθ' ἑταίρων τέρψεαι δ' ἀκούων.

(cf. *Studi* II; Korzeniewski, 124f.).

A count of more or less certain epicisms in this poem shows that, while iambics and dactyls are certainly no watertight compartments, the hemiepes is definitely more often used for epic words and expressions (for details, cf. the commentary):

hemiepes: certain epicisms fr. 196 λυσιμελής; 13 πείσομαι ὥς με κέλεαι; 15 μέγαιρε; 19 ἢ πρὶν ἐπῆν; 29 τηλεθάεσσι; 35 ἀφῆκα μένος; probable epicisms 3 ἔστιν + place adjunct; 5 εἶδος ἄμωμον ἔχειν; 23 γείτοσι χάρμ'; 31 παρφαμένην (if correct).

iambics: certain epicisms fr. 196 δάμναται πόθος; 2 θυμὸς ἰθύει; 8 εὐρώεσσ'; 34 ἀμφαφώμενος; probable epicisms 18 ἄνθος...παρθενήϊον; 32 χερσὶν...ἐφηψάμην.

On the other hand, the hemiepes is also capable of harbouring the unepic and unmetrical ἐς κόρακας ἄπεχε (21); cf. (17, iambic) αἰαῖ, πέπειρα.

In some cases, the hemiepes contains the topic, and the subsequent iambics the comment: 3 ἔστιν ἐν ἡμετέρου; 7 Ἀμφιμεδοῦς θύγατερ; 9 τέρψιές εἰσι θεῆς; 11 ταῦτα δ'...; 13 πείσομαι ὥς με κέλεαι; 25 ἡ δὲ μάλ'...; 33 -έφαινε νεόν (sometimes it is the other way round: 16f. Νεοβούλην; 21ff. μὴ τοῦτ'...ὅπως).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Barigazzi, "Note al nuovo Archiloco", MCr 8-9, 1973-74, 5-10.
M. G. Bonanno, "Note al nuovo Archiloco", MCr 8-9, 1973-74, 11-13.
S. Boscherini et al., "Per il nuovo Archiloco", Prometheus 1, 1975, 181-182.
F. Bossi, "Note al nuovo Archiloco", MCr 8-9, 1973-74, 14-17.
J. M. Bremer, "The meadow of love and two passages in Euripides' *Hippolytus*", Mnem. IV 28, 1975, 268-280.
G. Burzacchini, "Nota al nuovo Archiloco", MCr 8-9, 1973-74, 18.
G. Burzacchini, cf. Degani-Burzacchini.
W. M. Calder III, "Archilochus, The Cologne erotic fragment: A note", CJ 75, 1979-80, 42-43.
V. Casadio, "Note al nuovo Archiloco", MCr 8-9, 1973-74, 19-21.
A. Casanova, "Un'interpretazione del nuovo Archiloco", Prometheus 2, 1976, 18-40.
Q. Cataudella, "Nuovo Archiloco", Cultura e Scuola XIII-51, 1974, 32-38.
E. Degani, "Il nuovo Archiloco", A&R 19, 1974, 113-128.
E. Degani, "Sul nuovo Archiloco" in: E. Degani (ed.), *Poeti greci giambici ed elegiaci*, Letture critiche, Milano 1977, 15-43.
E. Degani-G. Burzacchini, *Lirici greci. Antologia*. Firenze, 1977, 3-22.
J. D. Denniston, *The Greek particles*. Oxford, 1954².
e.p., cf. Merkelbach-West.
J. Ebert-W. Luppe, "Zum neuen Archilochos-Papyrus", ZPE 16, 1975, 223-233.
H. Flashar, cf. *Poet.*
C. Gallavotti, "Archilochus restitutus", Helikon 13-14, 1973-74, 363-369.

C. Gallavotti, "Note al nuovo Archiloco", MCr 8-9, 1973-74, 22-31.
Th. Gelzer, "Archilochos und der neue Kölner Papyrus", MH 32, 1975, 12-32.
Th. Gelzer, cf. *Poet.*
D. Hagedorn, cf. Kramer-Hagedorn.
J. Henderson, "The Cologne Epode and the conventions of early Greek erotic poetry", Arethusa 9, 1976, 159-179.
A. Henrichs, "Riper than a pear: Parian invective in Theokritos", ZPE 39, 1980, 7-27.
J. C. Kamerbeek, "Remarques sur le nouvel Archiloque", Mnem. IV 29, 1976, 113-128.
R. Kannicht, "Archilochos, Horaz und Hephaistion", ZPE 18, 1975, 285-287.
L. Koenen, "Papyrology in the Federal Republic of Germany (...)", Stud. Pap. 15, 1976, 39-79.
L. Koenen, "τῶν τίς ἀρχέσει;", ZPE 37, 1980, 196-197.
L. Koenen, cf. *Poet.*
D. Korzeniewski, *Griechische Metrik*, Darmstadt 1968.
B. Kramer-D. Hagedorn, *Kölner Papyri* (*P. Köln*). Band 2, Opladen 1978, 13-30.
F. Lasserre, "Archiloque et la jeune fille aux cheveux blonds", AC 44, 1975, 506-530.
W. Luppe, cf. Ebert-Luppe.
M. Marcovich, "A new poem of Archilochus", GRBS 16, 1975, 5-14.
B. Marzullo, "Note al nuovo Archiloco", MCr 8-9, 1973-74, 32-92.
K. Maurer, cf. *Poet.*
R. Merkelbach, "Epilog des einen der Herausgeber", ZPE 14, 1974, 113.
R. Merkelbach, "Nachträge zu Archilochos", ZPE 16, 1975, 220-222.
R. Merkelbach-M. L. West, "Ein Archilochos-Papyrus", ZPE 14, 1974, 97-112.
D. Page, *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis*. Oxford, 1974, 150-154. [*SLG*]
Poet., "Ein wiedergefundenes Archilochos-Gedicht?" (Text und Diskussion), Th. Gelzer-W. Theiler-L. Koenen-M. L. West-H. Flashar-K. Maurer, Poetica 6, 1974, 468-512.
A. E. Raubitschek, "Zu Pap. Köln 58 = Arch. fr. 196A West", ZPE 39, 1980, 48.
E. Risch, "Sprachliche Bemerkungen zum neuen Archilochos-Fragment", Grazer Beiträge 4, 1975, 219-229.
W. Rösler, "Die Dichtung des Archilochos und die neue Kölner Epode", RhM 119, 1976, 289-310.
L. E. Rossi, "Asynarteta from the archaic to the Alexandrian poets: on the authenticity of the new Archilochus", Arethusa 9, 1976, 207-229.
L. E. Rossi, "Teoria e storia degli asinarteti dagli arcaici agli Alessandrini", Pubbl. Ist. Filol. Class. e Mediev. Genova, 47, 1978, 29-48.
F. Sisti, "Sul Pap. Col. inv. 7511", RCCM 17, 1975, 221-232.
S. R. Slings, "Three notes on the new Archilochus papyrus", ZPE 18, 1975, 170.
S. R. Slings, "Archilochus, the hasty mind and the hasty bitch", ZPE 21, 1976, 283-288.
S. R. Slings, "Archilochus, eerste Keulse epode", Lampas 13, 1980, 315-335.
S. R. Slings, "Archil. *S* 478 (a), 3 Page", MCr 15-17, 1980-82, 11-14.
S. R. Slings, "Studi sugli epodi di Archiloco", to appear in: *QUCC*.
F. Stoessl, "Das Liebesgedicht des Archilochos", RhM 119, 1976, 242-266.
Studi, cf. Slings.
V. Tammaro, "Note al nuovo Archiloco", MCr 13-14, 1978-79, 45-48.
W. Theiler, "Die Ueberraschung des Kölner Archilochos", MH 34, 1977, 56-71.
W. Theiler, cf. *Poet.*
M. Treu, "Archilochos und die Schwestern", RhM 119, 1976, 97-126.
J. Van Sickle, "The new erotic fragment of Archilochus", QUCC 20, 1975, 125-156.
J. Van Sickle, "Archilochus: a new fragment of an epode", CJ 71, 1975, 1-15.
J. Van Sickle, "The doctored text. Translating a new fragment of Archilochus", Modern Language Notes 90, 1975, 872-885.
J. Van Sickle, "Introduction, I. The problem of authorship. II. The meaning of line 10", Arethusa 9, 1976, 133-147.

J. Van Sickle, "On the Cologne Epode's end again: An antinote", CJ 75, 1979-80, 225-228.
M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin-New York, 1974.
M. L. West, "Archilochus ludens. Epilogue of the other editor", ZPE 16, 1975, 217-219.
M. L. West, "Two notes on the Cologne Epode of Archilochus", ZPE 26, 1977, 44-48.
M. L. West, *Delectus ex iambis et elegis Graecis*. Oxonii 1980. [West, *Del.*]
M. L. West, cf. Merkelbach-West.

C ARCHILOCHUS

'SECOND COLOGNE EPODE' (fr. 188)

Apart from lines 36-40 of the Cologne papyrus (cf. *B*), fragments 189-191, which fit in with the metrical structure, seem to belong to this poem; as for fr. 192, the subject-matter seems foreign to it (a futile attempt to integrate it can be read in Lasserre, 152-159; cf. Adrados 1981, 178f.; 224). A woman, perhaps Neoboule, is addressed—the only certain instance in Archilochus of a poem having a female addressee—and taunted with her withered beauty; the decay of her body seems to be ascribed to sexual promiscuity (fr. 189; 191). We have to do with the famous *fis anus*-theme, developed with a surprising wealth of metaphors. Our poem may have been the example of Horat. *Epode* 8 (F. Olivier, *Les épodes d'Horace*, Lausanne-Paris 1917, *ad loc.*); cf. Bonanno.

The metrical structure (which had been postulated by Elmsley and Snell):

– ⏕ – ⏕ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ / – ⏑ – ⏑ – – //
× – ⏑ – × / – ⏑ – ⏑ – – ///

(4 da / ith // 3 iaΛ///; it is not quite certain whether or not there is *pausa* after 4 da, in other words, whether this is a distichic or a tristichic epode, cf. West 1974, 135). The scheme is also that of *AP* XIII 26; Horat. *Carm.* I 4. The first line recurs Theoc. *Epigr.* 20; 21; Call. fr. 554; *Epigr.* 40Pf.; Phalaec. IV G.-P. = *AP* XIII 27; *AP* XIII 8; 28; *GV* 102 Peek; the second line Asclep. XXXIII G.-P. = *AP* XIII 23; *AP* XIII 20. Note the similar endings of the lines, underscored by the compulsory word-end after second *anceps* in the catalectic trimeter, as in all occurrences quoted, except Asclep. XXXIII,2.

1 (36) Οὐκέ ⌋ θ' ὁμῶς θάλλεις ἁπαλὸν χρόα· κάρφετα̣ ι ι γὰρ ἤδη
ὄγμο ⌋ ς, κακοῦ δὲ⟦πι⟧ γήραος κα̣θα̣⟨ι⟩ρ̣ε̣ῖ
]ἀ̣φ' ἱμερτοῦ δὲ θο̣ρὼν γλυκὺ̣ς ἵμερος π̣[ροσώπου
4 (39)]κ̣εν· ἦ γὰρ πολλὰ δή σ' ἐ̣πῆι̣ξεν
πνεύμ]α̣τα χειμερί̣ων ἀνέμων ⟨⏑ ⏑⟩ π̣(ο)λλάκις δ'ε[

Sources: *P. Colon.* inv. 7511 = *P. Köln* 58, 36-40.
Hephaestion, *Encheiridion* 6,3 = 19,5-10 Consbruch.
Ἔστι δὲ ἐν αὐτῶι (sc. the trochee) ἐπίσημον καὶ τὸ δίμετρον βραχυκατάληκτον τὸ καλούμενον ἰθυφαλλικόν· ὧι πρῶτος μὲν Ἀρχίλοχος κέχρηται, συζεύξας αὐτὸ δακτυλικῶι τετραμέτρωι οὕτως· οὐκέθ'—ἤδη.

id. 7,4 = 22,7-11 Consbruch.
Καὶ τῶν ἀκαταλήκτων δὲ (sc. dactyls) τὸ τετράμετρον Ἀρχίλοχος ἔνδοξον ἐποίησε διὰ τὸ προτάξαι αὐτὸ τροχαϊκοῦ τοῦ καλουμένου ἰθυφαλλικοῦ οὕτως· οὐκέθ'—ἤδη.
id. 15,8 = 49,25-50,3 Consbruch.
Ἓν μὲν δὴ τοῦτο τῶν παρ' Ἀρχιλόχωι ἀσυναρτήτων· ἄλλο δὲ τὸ ἐκ δακτυλικῆς τετραποδίας καὶ αὐτοῦ ἰθυφαλλικοῦ· οὐκέθ'—ἤδη.
Scholia A ad Hephaest. 6,3 = 123,25-27 Consbruch.
τροχαϊκὸν δίμετρον βραχυκατάληκτον, ὃ καλεῖται ἰθυφαλλικόν· κάρφεται γὰρ ἤδη.
Scholia B ad Hephaest. 6 = 270,3-7; 12-15 Consbruch.
μονόμετρον μὲν οὖν τροχαϊκὸν...ἀκατάληκτον δὲ ὡς τόδε· κάρφεται γάρ. ...δίμετρον δὲ βραχυκατάληκτον μὲν ὡς τοῦτο· κάρφεται γὰρ ἤδη. τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἰθυφαλλικὸν καλεῖται.
id. ad Hephaest. 7 = 273,7-9 Consbruch.
ἀκατάληκτον δὲ (dactylic tetrameter) τὸ καὶ Ἀρχιλοχεῖον, ὃ καὶ δίμοιρον ἔπος λέγεται· οὐκέθ' ὅμως—χρόα.
Atilius Fortunatianus, *Ars* 28 = VI 298,8-9 Keil.
Quarta quoque (sc. ode) dicolos, ad exemplum Archilochi facta, οὐκετομος ἄλλοις απολλων...(298,19) οὐκ ἔθ ὁμρ^οιος ἄλλοις ἀπόλλων χρόα (A) ουκ εθομε αλλοις απολλων χερσα (B)...(299,8-10) Secundus uersus... syllaba breuior est quam trimeter iambicus...(299,14-17) Archilochus ολμον κακον. ⟨reliquum⟩ in Archilocho attendendum. hunc quidam hendecasyllabum archilochium dixerunt.
Hephaestion, *Encheiridion* 5,3 = 16,20f. Consbruch.
τρίμετρον δὲ (sc. catalectic iambic) οἷον τὸ Ἀρχιλόχου ὄγμος—καθαιρεῖ.
Georgius Choeroboscus *in Hephaest.* 6 = 228,21-25 Consbruch.
τότε βακχεῖος εὑρεθήσεται ὁ πέμπτος πούς, οἱονεὶ ὁ ἐκ βραχείας καὶ δύο μακρῶν συγκείμενος, οἷον τὸ Ἀρχιλόχου τρίμετρον ὄγμος—καθαιρεῖ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα.
Scholia B ad Hephaest. 5 = 268,1f. Consbruch.
καταληκτικὸν δὲ (sc. iambic trimeter) ὡς τὸ ὄγμος—καθαιρεῖ.
Hesychius κ 931 Latte.
κάρφεται· ξηραίνεται.

Diacritic and punctuation signs:
1 (36) κάρ 2 (37)]σ·κα κα̣θ .ρ̣ε̣̂ι. 3 (38)].φ'ι κὺσ̣ ⸤ίμε (u.v.)
4 (39)]κ̣εν·ῆ δησ' 5 (40) ⁑ἀ̣λλακισδ'ε[

1 The beginning of a new poem was probably marked by paragraphos plus coronis; there was no ἔκθεσις as in fr. 113,7. After line 1 (36), the interlinear space becomes considerably smaller, as does the space be-

tween the letters in the line: apparently the scribe wanted to get as much of the poem into this column as he could (presumably because he wished to write as many lines to the column as his exemplar had).

οὐκέθ' ὁμῶς: Cf. I 605 οὐκέθ' ὁμῶς τιμῆς ἔσεαι; Sol. fr. 27,12; Theogn. 930; Pi. *I.* 3,6 οὐχ ὁμῶς πάντα χρόνον θάλλων ὁμιλεῖ; π 182 χρὼς οὐκέθ' ὁμοῖος. οὐκέτι (cf. Alcm. 29,1 *PMG*) became a popular *incipit* in elegy and epigrams, cf. Theogn. 1337; Meleager LX G.-P. = *AP* V 204 (on an outworn ἐρωμένη). Note the effective word-order: "no longer—to the same extent (as before)—are you flourishing".

θάλλεις ἁπαλὸν χρόα: Both θάλλω of human physical beauty and the internal accusative (instead of the dative) are novelties; for the former, cf. *AP* XI 374,7f. (Maced., clearly imitating this passage: ὡς δὲ ῥόδον θαλέθεσκες ἐν εἴαρι· νῦν δ' ἐμαράνθης γήραος αὐχμηρῶι καρφομένη θέρεϊ; cf. *B*, ad 18); for the latter, cf. E. *Ba.* 1186f. γένυν...κατάκομον θάλλει; fr. 971,1. The phrase is an original variation on the common theme of ἥβης ἄνθος, cf. *B*, ad 18.

ἁπαλὸν χρόα: cf. ἁπαλόχροος, Hes. *Op.* 519; *Hy. Aphr.* 14; Theogn. 1341; τέρενα χρόα, Δ 237 etc.; Hes. *Th.* 5 etc.—contrast the use of ἁπαλός fr. 191,3. The phrase returns in the 'Meropis', 903A10 *Suppl.Hell.* The vanishing of youth is often mentioned in connection with the skin, cf. Sapph. fr. 58,13 πά]ντα χρόα γῆρας ἤδη, cf. 21,6; perhaps Tyrt. fr. 10,27—contrast *B*, 33 νέον, ἥβης ἐπήλυσιν, χρόα.

1f. κάρφεται...ὄγμος: For the opposition θάλλεις : κάρφεται, cf. Maced. quoted above; Phil. XXXIII 3-6 G.-P. = *AP* VII 383 τέθηλε : καρφοῦται. Cf. ν 398 κάρψω μὲν χρόα καλόν; Hes. *Op.* 575; 588; δέρμα καρφαλέον Hp. *Aph.* 5,71. On the basis of these parallels we should expect the skin to be subject—ὄγμος, placed in enjambment (the first of three successive ones), comes as a surprise, and the expression κάρφεται ὄγμος, if correct, is one of the boldest in Archilochus. It can be explained as a variation on ὄγμον ἐλαύνω (Λ 68) or ἄγω (Theoc. 10,2—at both places ὄγμος means 'swathe' not 'furrow', but cf. Hes. *Op.* 439 αὔλακ' ἐλαύνοι; Pi. *P.* 4,227f.); for a similar object of effect, cf. fr. 181,10 τάμνων κέ]λευθον. There is no parallel for ὄγμος used metaphorically for wrinkles in the human skin, but we shall have to accept it anyway (cf. Martial. III 72,4 *sulcos uteri*; Apul. *Apol.* 16,7 *sulcos rugarum*). The singular is probably collective, cf. κῦμα (fr. 13,3; 24,12; 212); ὄρος (fr. 122,9). It is presumably the whole body, not the face, which is said to be wrinkled; Horace conflated this expression with the πρόσωπον of line 3 (*Epode* 8,3f. *et rugis uetus frontem senectus exaret*; cf. Verg. *Aen.* VII 417 *frontem...rugis arat*; contrast Ovid. *Ars amat.* II 118 *rugae, quae tibi corpus arent*).

On the basis of Horace, Snell proposed ὄγμοις, mainly in order to get rid of the singular. There is no morphological objection (datives in -οις

may be tolerated in the epodes, cf. ZPE 53, 1983, 35), the space preceding]σ in the papyrus neither proves nor disproves it (the low point after]σ is equivalent to a comma; it was meant to prevent readers from connecting ὄγμος with κακοῦ γήραος, cf. Adrados' fr. 80; 1981, 221). But the evidence is insufficient (*exarare rugis* is not to be put on a par with κάρφειν ὄγμοις; Horace's phrase is modelled on *sulcis arare*, not on the Greek) and the dative ὄγμοις makes little sense ("le rughe sono effetto e non causa agente dell'azione di κάρφω", Medaglia, 10; other values of the dative in the phrase as postulated by Snell's conjecture—concomitant circumstance; aim; place—are all thoroughly unsatisfactory).

ἤδη: Cf. the use of this word in Sappho as quoted above; Anacr. 432,1 *PMG* κνύζη τις ἤδη καὶ πέπειρα γίνομαι. The sense is not so much "you have grown wrinkles already" as "things have gone so far that you now have grown wrinkles". The word, at line-end, corresponds to οὐκέθ' at the beginning of the line.

2 κακοῦ...γήραος: Cf. Θ 103 etc. χαλεπόν...γῆρας; Hes. *Op.* 331 κακῶι ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῶι; Sol. fr. 24,10 κακὸν γῆρας = Theogn. 728; 1011; Mimn. fr. 4,1f. Note Horace's *aemulatio in imitando* (*uetus...senectus*, 'extreme old age'). The relation between wrinkles and old age lies at the bottom of the phrase γῆρας ἀποξῦσαι (I 446; *Hy. Aphr.* 224; *Nosti* fr. 6,2 Allen).

κ̣α̣θα̣⟨ι⟩ρ̣ε̣ῖ: Between θ and ρ̣, traces suit α (crowded against θ); there is hardly space for αι and no iota is visible. After the word, a point at letter-bottom height (partly obscured by the acute on ἵμερος in 3); it must denote a rhetorical, not a syntactical, pause, because the subject (and perhaps the object as well) is missing. The meaning must be 'overtake' (cf. Hes. *Sc.* 245 γῆρας...μέμαρπεν; β 99f. μιν μοῖρα...καθέλῃσι...θανάτοιο; γ 238; τ 145; ω 135; ι 372f. κὰδ δέ μιν ὕπνος ἥιρεε; Ω 4f.; ρ 323 μιν κατὰ δούλιον ἦμαρ ἕλῃισιν; Sapph. fr. 149 ὄτα πάννυχος ἄσφι κατάγρει, sc. ὕπνος; fr. 2,8?; Simon. 542,16 *PMG* ὃν ἀμήχανος συμφορὰ καθέλῃι; Hsch. κ 75 Latte καθαιρεῖ· καταλαμβάνει). For its subject, we need a noun in line 3 to explain κακοῦ...γήραος (preferably in such a way that the phrase becomes equivalent to κακὸν γῆρας; a similar circumlocution seems to be present in Pi. *Pae.* 1,1 πρὶν ὀδυνηρὰ γήραος σ̣[.....μ]ο̣λεῖν). Marzullo's μοῖρά σ'] comes close to epic examples (cf. β 99f. etc. quoted above) and can be paralleled from the iambographers (ad.iamb. 35,16 μοῖρα νηλεὴς κιχήσεται; cf. also Call. fr. 1,15 μοῖρα κίχεν θανάτου; Mimn. fr. 6,2), but it is almost certainly too long; West's αἶσά σ'] (ap. e.p.) is preferable (cf. Ω 428 = 750 θανάτοιο περ αἴσῃι and the formular κακὴ αἶσα), if perhaps too epical. πῆμά σ'] (Snell ap. e.p.) is possible, cf. γ 152 πῆμα κακοῖο; χεῖμά σ'] (Lebek ibid.) a trifle artificial; Medaglia's ἶδος] and Marzullo's αὐχμός] very much so (σ' αὐχμός, introducing an enclitic to

follow *pausa*, is impossible). I do not understand Gallavotti's καθαίρει ἶπος ("sulcus...quem horrendae senectutis pondus imminens purgat", *Hlk.* 368), which unnccessarily neglects the papyrus' circumflex. Ebert-Luppe's σῆμά σ'] (cf. Sol. fr. 27,4 ἥβης...σήματα) does not seem to fit in semantically with καθαιρεῖ (but cf. Pi. *l.c.*). The object σ(ε) is desirable, though not absolutely necessary: perhaps κάρφεται...ὄγμος is a parenthesis, so that the subject of θάλλεις can be supplied as object here (cf. γ 238; Medaglia 12 n. 16); 'your skin' is ruled out as object because καθαιρέω requires a personal object in this meaning.

3 ἱμερτοῦ...π[ροσώπου (e.p.; both π[and μ[possible): Sapph. fr. 112,4 ἔρος δ' ἐπ' ἰμέρτωι κέχυται προσώπωι and *Hy. Hom.* 10,2 ἐφ' ἱμερτῶι δὲ προσώπωι (where cf. 2 ἱμερτῶι, 3 ἱμερτόν, 5 ἱμερόεσσαν as a parallel to ἱμερτοῦ...ἵμερος here) confirm the supplement beyond reasonable doubt. Cf. also Stes. S 107,1 *SLG* ἱμερτὸν πρ[. Originally, ἱμερτός is 'desired' (so Archil. fr. 166,3), ἱμερόεις 'exciting desire' (Γ 397 στήθεα; Ξ 170 χρώς). The order withered skin—unlovely face is a compendium of ν 398-401; cf. 430-433 (Athena making Odysseus unrecognizable): κάρψω...χρόα ...ὀλέσω τρίχας, ἀμφὶ δὲ λαῖφος ἕσσω...κνυζώσω δέ τοι ὄσσε. In fact, it would seem that it is especially the eyes that make the face ἱμερτόν, cf. Hes. *Th.* 910 τῶν καὶ ἀπὸ βλεφάρων ἔρος εἴβετο δερκομενάων; S. *Ant.* 795f. ἐναργὴς βλεφάρων ἵμερος εὐλέκτρου νύμφας and Jebb's note; Theoc. 18,37 τᾶς πάντες ἐπ' ὄμμασιν ἵμεροί ἐντι. So too, perhaps, Sapph. fr. 16,18 ἀμάρυχμα λάμπρον...προσώπω.

θορὼν: This reading (West ap. e.p.) is morc likely than θέρων (Merkelbach ap. e.p.; a stroke of ink on a twisted fibre creates the impression of a horizontal bar). Whether θέρων should be taken literally (so Medaglia) or metaphorically (cf. Pi. *O.* 10,87 μάλα δέ οἱ θερμαίνει φιλότατι νόον), its absolute use, and purely adjectival at that, is somewhat strange; Gallavotti (*Hlk.* 367) wrongly compares *flagrans amor*—we must wonder whether Archilochus was capable of using the equivalent of *urens amor.* (It should bc noted that the active θέρω does not recur until Hellenistic times, but the fact that Anacreon is said to have used ἥδω—476 *PMG*—should warn us that the lyricists were capacle of creating causative actives corresponding to ancient intransitive *media tantum*). θορών does not, I think, suggest that ἵμερος is jumping from her face: the idea is rather that of its having cvaporated. Cf. α 58f. ἱέμενος καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρῴσκοντα νοῆσαι ἧς γαίης; A. *Cho.* 845f. λόγοι πεδάρσιοι θρῴσκουσι, θνήσκοντες μάτην. It is immaterial whether ἀφ' belongs with θορών or with the genitive; cf. ad *B*, 8; Simon. fr. 128,2 D. ἀφ' ἱμερτὴν ἔπνεεν ἡλικίην.

γλυκὺς ἵμερος: A frequent formula, cf. Γ 139; χ 500; *Hy. Aphr.* 2; Pi. *O.* 3,32. ἵμερος is sometimes the force that excites desire, not desire itself, cf. Ξ 198. For ἱμερτοῦ...ἵμερος, cf. fr. 2,1 μᾶζα μεμαγμένη; 126,2 κακῶς...κακοῖς; 128,6 χαρτοῖσιν ...χαῖρε; 133,2f. τοῦ ζοοῦ...⟨οἱ⟩ ζοοί.

4]κ̣εν (]πεν excluded because the upper right-hand end of the letter preceding ε is not high enough): obviously a perfect (hardly a κ-aorist), preferably of a verb with a neutral meaning (all has been said with θορών): βέβηκεν (Lebek ap. e.p.) is satisfactory (for βέβηκε '*fuit*', cf. Alc. fr. 306Ab 20f.). cf. E. *Med.* 439 βέβακε...χάρις; οἴχωκεν (e.p.) introduces a form not attested before the fifth century; πέπτωκεν (e.p.) contradicts θορών; πέπτηκεν (Marzullo) is a pleonasm; ἔσβηκεν (Gallavotti) and τέτηκεν (Medaglia) yield mixed metaphors.

ἦ...πολλὰ δή: Remarkably similar Semon. fr. 22 ⟨ἦ⟩ πολλὰ μὲν δή, where Bergk's conjecture is confirmed.

σ': This must be σε not σοι (which is not elided in Archilochus and hardly found in the iambographers anyway, cf. West 1974, 100; ad *D*, III), although even in Homer ἐπαΐσσω is found more frequently with the dative than with the accusative.

ἐ̣πῆι̣ξεν (ξ certain): The first occurrence of the contracted form of this verb; the contraction counters the epic effect of the verb (not found elsewhere in iambus; one uncertain instance of ἤϊξαν in elegy, Mimn. fr. 13a2) and the construction. Used of the winds also B 146; Pi. *I.* 3,24.

5].: The end of a stroke at letter-bottom height, protruding to the right; all vowels but α excluded. πνεύμ]α̣τα (Lebek and West ap. e.p.) is certain because of A. *Pr.* 1085f. ἀνέμων πνεύματα; E. *HF* 102 πνεύματ' ἀνέμων; Hdt. VII 16α1; Emped. fr. 84,3f. ἀνέμων πνεῦμα. The phrase is a variation of epic πνοαὶ ἀνέμοιο (M 207 etc.; P 55f. πνοιαί...ἀνέμων, cf. δ 839; Hes. *Th.* 253; 268; Pi. *P.* 3,104; 5,121; Sapph. fr. 90aIII 22 ζεφύρω πνεῦμα) Gallavotti's ῥεύμ]α̣τα is strange at best—winds do not stream—and is backed up insufficiently by Emped. fr. 100,24 αἰθέρος...ῥεῦμα. It is not true that ῥεύμ]α̣τα accounts for the space better than πνεύμ]α̣τα. ἄνεμοι χειμέριοι is attested for Democritus (fr. 14,3) in an untrustworthy source; cf. B 293f. ἄελλαι χειμέριαι; *Hy. Hom.* 33,7f.

What exactly have wintry storms to do with female beauty? Merkelbach-West refer, somewhat cryptically, to Horat. *Carm.* IV 13, 8-10 *pulchris excubat in genis* (sc. *cupido*). *importunus enim transuolat aridas quercus* (there may be a reminiscence of Archilochus, cf. 11 *rugae*; 17 *quo fugit uenus* cet.); I take it that Archilochus is supposed to compare the withered woman to a tree battered by storms (cf. P 55f.; Hes. *Op.* 509-511; Theoc. 24,90 ἀνέμωι δεδονημένον αὖον ἄχερδον; 8,57 δένδρεσι μὲν χειμὼν φοβερὸν κακόν; Verg. *Ecl.* 3,81); if so, the image must have been explained in the next sentence, and there is no direct parallel; Horat. *Carm.* I 25,19f. *aridas frondis hiemis sodali dedicet Euro* (sc. *laeta pubes*), adduced by Bonanno, comes closest. Marzullo (91f.) compares Hes. *Op.* 518f. but he misunderstands the passage (the point is not that the violence of the wintry winds "non intacca il tenero ma vigoroso corpo della vergine", but that

they do not touch young girls because these are unmarried and therefore have to stay at home anyway, 520f.; cf. Ps.-Phocyl. *Sent.* 215f.; *AP* V 297 (Agath.)). The easiest explanation is that the woman has seen many winter storms, i.e. many winters (years), therefore (cf. γάρ) her loveliness has vanished.

.α̣λλακισ with π̣. above the line: The first α̣ is perhaps cancelled by an oblique stroke; the letter before it is not, I think, a μ (all that is left is a purely perpendicular hasta; the first stroke of μ is always oblique—even in 23 ἔσομαι adduced by West ap. e.p.—and normally slightly curved). The original reading must be παλλακισ; of the traces above it (most of which have got mixed up with the large bottom stroke of ξ in ἐπῆιξεν above them), only π̣ is reasonably certain. The correction must be either π̣ο̣ or π̣ο̣λ̣. Therefore one must not read μά̣⟨λα⟩ π̣ο̣λλάκις (e.p.) but ⟨μάλα⟩ π̣(ο)λλάκις. μάλα is still the best conjecture, cf. Θ 362; fr. 14,2 μάλα πόλλ'; it is probably the only one that can explain the postponement of δ' after πολλάκις, unless of course one looks for a word to end the preceding sentence, not to introduce this one (e.g. Gallavotti's ἅμα—it is not possible to read the supralinear letters as α̣μ̣[α]—, "many winds at the same time", taken metaphorically as "lovers"; the position of ἅμα at sentence-end is abnormal). For μάλα / πολλάκις straddling the diaeresis, cf. fr. 191,1 ὑπὸ καρδίην ἐλυσθείς; for πολλά...πολλάκις, cf. fr. 130,3f.

δ'ε[: Apostrophos certain.

I have little to add to West's treatment of fr. 189-191 (1974, 134f.). For fr. 189, cf. D. Gerber, QUCC 16, 1973, 105-109; E. Degani, QUCC 21, 1976, 24f.; for fr. 191, Degani in Degani-Burzacchini, 31-33; for ἁπαλὰς φρένας, cf. also B. fr. 20B6f.

Lasserre adds various fragments to this poem; I confine myself to his less unhappy suggestions:

Fr. 66 (140; Adrados 1981, 221f.). If it were certain that φῦμα μηρῶν μεταξύ is exactly what Archilochus wrote, its collocation in this epode would be plausible (φῦμα to close the ithyphallic, μηρῶν μεταξύ to open the catalectic trimeter), because Horace seems to imitate it near the beginning of *Epode* 8 (5f. *hietque turpis inter aridas natis podex uelut crudae bouis*), cf. A. Aloni, ZPE 40, 1980, 34f. But the quotation in *An.Ox.* I 164 Cramer is not precise enough to warrant the assumption (which would make for a rather crude contrast with ἁπαλὸν χρόα, ἱμερτοῦ προσώπου, γλυκὺς ἵμερος). See V. Grassmann, *Die erotischen Epoden des Horaz*, München 1966, 6.

Fr. 205 (Lasserre, 140f.; Adrados 1981, 222). The hypothesis that ἠλείφεο is trisyllabic breaks down on the fact that the catalectic trimeter

ends in ⏑ – – (in all examples from Archilochus and all other Greek and Latin authors quoted in the introduction, except *AP* XIII 20,4). Besides, I am inclined to believe that ἠλείφετο is what Archilochus actually wrote (Plutarch had to change the form because of his anecdote).

Fr. 252 (Lasserre, 142; Adrados 1981, 222). Again a nice parallel with *Epode* 8 (2; 17f.) and at first sight, the quotation ἀλλ' ἀπερρώγασι// μύχεω τένοντες seems to fit the metrical pattern beautifully, but I refuse to believe that an ithyphallic can end in three long syllables (the same objection holds for Adr. fr. 89 = 256 W.).

To end with a speculation of my own, may not fr. 247 ἁπαλὸν κέρας, with its dactylic rhythm, be good company for the blind eels of fr. 189?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

F. R. Adrados, *Líricos griegos; elegiacos y yambógrafos arcaicos*, I, Madrid 1981[2].
F. R. Adrados, *El mundo de la lírica griega antigua*, Madrid 1981.
M. G. Bonanno, "Sul secondo Epodo di Colonia", MCr 15-17, 1980-82, 19-26.
E. Degani-G. Burzacchini, *Lirici greci: Antologia*, Firenze 1977.
e.p., cf. Merkelbach-West.
J. Ebert-W. Luppe, "Zum neuen Archilochos-Papyrus", ZPE 16, 1975, 223-233.
C. Gallavotti, "Archilochus restitutus", Helikon 13-14, 1973-74, 363-369.
C. Gallavotti, "Note al nuovo Archiloco", MCr 8-9, 1973-74, 22-31.
B. Kramer-D. Hagedorn, *Kölner Papyri* (*P. Köln*), Band 2, Opladen 1978.
F. Lasserre, *Les épodes d'Archiloque*, Paris 1950.
W. Luppe, cf. Ebert-Luppe.
B. Marzullo, "Note al nuovo Archiloco", MCr 8-9, 1973-74, 32-92 (esp. 84-92).
S. M. Medaglia, "Archiloco, Orazio e il secondo epodo di Colonia", QUCC 25, 1977, 7-15.
R. Merkelbach-M. L. West, "Ein Archilochos-Papyrus", ZPE 14, 1974, 97-112.
B. Snell, "Zu den Fragmenten der griechischen Lyriker, 2. Archilochos fr. 113 u. 114 Diehl", Philologus 96, 1944, 283f. = *Gesammelte Schriften*, Göttingen 1966, 70f.
M. L. West, *Studies in Greek elegy and iambus*, Berlin-New York 1974.
M. L. West, cf. Merkelbach-West.

D ANONYMUS

COMMENTARY ON POEM(S) OF HIPPONAX

P. Oxy. 2176, twenty-four fragments of a roll writtcn in an upright hand of the type called "Strenger Stil" or "formal mixed" (Turner, 26f.) and dated by Lobel, its first editor, to the second century AD (I presume to submit that it is not earlier than AD 150). It is a commentary of the type called *hypomnema*: lemmas followed by exegesis (in this case, a mixture of detailed, mostly irrelevant, information and close paraphrasis). Lemmas are indicated by the paragraphus and scparated from what precedes (not from what follows) by a blank spacc. There are no punctuation signs and few diacritical signs. The writing is rather elegant for a hypomnema; only once do we find an abbreviation (III 10, perhaps the copyist did not understand it). A reader has entercd more notes of the same nature betwcen the lines and in the margin, in a cursive hand, using many abbreviations; this hand is regarded by Lobel as contemporary to the first.

After the publication, Lobel succeeded in joining various fragments (*P. Oxy.* xviii, p. 184f.; xix p. 153); Masson introduced capital letters to denote the fragments. In his otherwise excellent edition, Dcgani has thought fit to use letters different to Masson's, which is why I use Latin numerals instead. I present only the four most important fragments, which I examined at Oxford in October 1981. (My corrections of Lobcl's readings are printed in the Addenda of Deg.; corrections of printer's errors in that edition and my second thoughts on what can be read in thc papyrus are tacitly introduced in my text and notes; see now Degani 1984, 333-335.). First, the commentary will be treated, then the poetical remnants that can be gleaned from it.

I

. . . .

]. . . .   .[   ]. . [
1]ˆΩ Σάνν', ἐπειδ̣ὴ̣ ῥῖνα θεό[συλιν φορέ-
—
]εις καὶ γαστρ̣ο̣ς ο̣ὐ καταχρα̣[τέεις· κύρι-
ο]ν ὄνομα ὁ Σάν̣νος, ὦ̣ λοιδορ̣[εῖ
4]πεπ̣οιῆσθαί φασιν παρὰ τὴ[ν σαννάδα
]Κ̣ρη̣̃[τ]α̣ς δὲ τὰς ἀγρίας αἶγας λ̣έγειν σαν-
νάδας...φη]σιν Πολέμων ἐν τοῖς Πρ̣ὸς

7 Ἀντίγονον κα]ὶ Ἀδαῖον· τὰς δὲ αἶγας ἐπι
α]π̣οπλήκτους εἶναι καὶ ν . ι-
] καὶ ἐν τῶι βίωι τρ̣[ὺ]ς̣ εὐή-
10 θεις].μεν[ ]λλουδε του
]ν Ὦ Σά[ν]ν̣', ἐπ̣ειδὴ ῥῖνα
θεόσυλιν φορέει]ς̣, τοὺς μ̣οι παράσχες ὦ
13].ν· σύν τοί τι β̣ουλεῦσαι θέ-
λω·]ς τὴ̣ν ἱ̣ε̣ρόσ̣υλιν ῥῖνα
]ννε̣[.]αι̣[.]ο̣ντος αὐτοῦ
16]ν̣ ἀπὸ παν-
]ν τάχα̣ δὲ
]ν. .ομε-

. . . .

II

. . . .

1 οδ̣.[
αλ[τοὺς

βρα[χίονας καὶ τὸ]ν̣ τ̣ρ̣ά̣χ̣[ηλον
4 κατ̣[εσθί-] μ̣ή σε γαστρίη [λάβ-· στρό-
φο[ν γ]α̣στρὸς ἀλγηδ.[
μωι συνεχόμενοι εἰώθασ̣[ι
7 τὴν γαστέρα εἰς ἀπόδ⟨ε⟩ιξιν [τοῦ νενε-
κρῶσ̣θαι. ἰδέ σού φησιν τοὺς β[ραχίονας
καὶ τὸν τράχηλον, ὅτι ἐφθιν[ήκασιν, εἰ
10 καὶ κατεσθίεις, καὶ μή σε κατα[λάβ-
μος. πρῶτον μὲν ἐκδὺς νει̣.[(αι[above) παραι-

νεῖ αὐτῶι πρῶτον χειρονομ[
13 φάρμακον π⟦ο⟧ιεῖν· ῥαιδίως γὰρ ο̣[ὕτως τὸ
φάρμακον π(ο)ιεῖν καὶ ἀναδοθ[ῆναι.
τὸν Κωδάλου[νόμον
Αὐλήσει δέ σοι Κίκων τὸ Κωδά[λου μέλος·
16 σκεύ[ασα]ι δὲ τὸν Κίκωνα κ̣[
]...[

. . . .

III

. . . .

1]ηη̣[ ] .φο[
]νδη νύμφην τὸ η̣[
].η[ ]λαιμᾶι δέ σοι τὸ

χ.[
κρ[
χεῖ]λος ὡς [ἐρω]διοῦ[· ἀπὸ] τοῦ λαιμοῦ ωσαν κ.[
]κ(αὶ) μα̣[
]. ω̣σει̣. [..] ε̣λεγε[.ἀρ]π̣ακτικὸν δὲ τὸ
ὄρνεο]ν ὁ ἐ̣ρωδιό[ς· διὸ] κ̣[αὶ] τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ὀ-
δυ̣[σσ]έ̣α̣ ἐν τ̣[ῇ] Ν̣υκτ[ηγρ]εσίαι Ἀθηνᾶ ἐπι-
π̣έ̣μ̣π̣[ε]ι̣ τ[οῦτο]ν̣ τὸν̣ [οἰ]ωνὸν ἁρπασομέ-
νοις δηλονότι π̣[ ].[
να ὥσπερ καί γει[
ἐρωδιὸν Παλ(αμήδης) γρά̣[φει οὐκ
εὖ· ὡς ἐρωδιοῦ ω[
ος ἐκτιθεὶς τὰ .[
καθηγησαμεν[-
νῆσον̣ τα̣ύτην [
μεν̣[
κα.[
ὠσ[
α̣π̣ε̣[
.εδ.[

. . . .

IV

. . . .

]..[ ].[
]α̣ὐ̣τοὺς ἐπὶ χρόνο[ν]ε̣ω..[
σ]ῶμα ψύχηται· νῦν δ̣[ὲ ἐ]π̣ὶ ἄμμον θα-
λα]σσίαν ἐ̣[κ]βάλλουσι. τρ[ιτα]ῖον ἐκ κήρυ-
κο]ς ἀσμ̣ε̣[ν...]έ μιν· πρ[ὸς] αὐτὰ τὰ ἀνδρ̣[
].[ἠν]ε̣γκεν αὐ[τὸ]ν τριταῖον
]. προ[σ]κ̣η̣ρυ-
]τ̣ο κἀν τοῖς
].ημος δαρ-
ἐ]κ κήρυκος ε[
]ο̣μοῖον τῶι[
].τανησαν
]ντες ἆσσον
].ραφου
ἐγ]γὺς τῆς θα-
].ωμ̣α̣θε
ἐκβά]λ̣λουσι
]ω̣ρ̣ πατὴρ

]. ς διασχευ-
]ν νεχρὸν ε-
]αιωι ὀστέωι
]. Ἀριστοφά-
ν-]πολ[υ]ανδρει-
]. . ονων
]..ῆ⟦ει⟧
]ιναν κ(αὶ) πα.[
]φ( ) κ(αὶ) πρὸ τ(ῶν) [
]α Αἰγινῆτ(αι)[
]· δ ε̣ῖ γράφ[ειν
]· τίθεται μ[
]τα ο(ὕτω) μ(έν)τοι οὐδ' ἀπ[
]··α̣ν τὸ τίνυσ··

. . . .

Notes to the commentary

I. Fr. 1 col. i (+ fr. 9; cf. *P. Oxy*. xix. p. 153) (fr. 118 A W. = 129 A Deg.).

1f. The supplement θεό[συλιν (Lobel ap. Maas) is based on the paraphrase τὴν ἱερόσυλιν ῥῖνα (14; the line had been quoted anew 11f.). After that, there must have been at least three letters before line-end. If the supplements χαταχρα̣[τέεις· (Lobel) χύριο]ν (Maas ap. Fraenkel) (2f.) and Ἀντίγονον χα]ὶ (7) are accepted,]ω̣ (paragraphos not certain) was actually the first letter of line 1 (in other words, the beginning of the poem was not marked by εἴσθεσις); line 2 began with εις. Besides, since the scribe studiously avoided breaking off words contrarily to the rules of Greek syllabic division (West 1974, 147), using fillers where necessary for adhering to these rules, both τρέφ|εις and τρέ|φ]εις (Latte) are ruled out; of the supplements that do meet both conditions, φύεις (West) and ἄεις ('you satiate', Ebert ap. Deg. p. 222) are too short, φορέεις (Luppe; cf. φέρεις Diehl^3) seems exactly right (for uncontracted spelling of contracted syllables, cf. note on *B*, 6.

1 σᾰ́νν: The short-vowel sign is frequently placed on a vowel preceding a double consonant, a habit that originated in editions and transcriptions of Lesbian texts: a Lesbian short vowel plus geminated consonant often corresponded to Κοινή long vowel plus single consonant (e.g. χρᾰ́νναν = χρήνην). Cf. my remarks in Mnemos. IV 32, 1979, 248.

There are illegible traces of scholia over σαννε and η̣ρ

2f. [κύρι|ο]ν not [κύ|ριο]ν, cf. supra. "Sannos is a proper name [of the person] that he abuses" or "Sannos is a proper name, by means of which he abuses [his target]", in other words, a 'speaking name'. The latter is probably what the commentator meant, since he goes on to explain the abusive character of the name. Cf. *Notes to the Poem(s)*, I 1.

3 λοιδορ[εῖται (Lobel), ἄλλοι δὲ (Maas ap. Fraenkel; too long): λοιδορ[εῖται, ὃ ἔνιοι (Latte; suits the space, but a full stop before ὃ is better; alternatively: λοιδορ[εῖ. τοῦτο γάρ).

4 "They say that it is derived from the word σαννάς"; παρὰ τή[ν σαννάδα (Snell apud D.[3]): παρὰ τή[ν σαννάς (Maas ap. Fraenkel; too short and I doubt if the nominative can be combined with feminine articles when nouns are quoted: ἡ ἐγώ (sc. ἀντωνυμία) is all-right, but I would expect τὸ σαννάς (sc. ὄνομα)).

5f. "And that the Cretans call wild goats σαννάδες, as Polemon says in his book *Against Antigonus and Adaeus*." Κρῆτας (Latte) is certain; I transcribed]κρ.[.]ασ. In line 6, -νάδας φη]σὶν (Degani) is too short, -νάδας παρίστη]σιν (Latte) too long; both καθά (Lobel) and ὥς (West) φη]σιν will do. The wild goats of Crete were famous (Arist. *HA* 612a3; Verg. *Aen.* XII 614); the word σανάδα is still used for them in Crete (G. N. Hatzidakis, Glotta 12, 1923, 148f.). Cf. Hsch. σ 171 Schm.; *P. Oxy*. 3329 Fr. 1 14: σαννάδας· τὰς ἀγρίας αἶγας. For Polemon of Ilium, an antiquary of the first half of the second century BC, nicknamed Περιηγητής and στηλοκόπας, cf. Pfeiffer, 247-249. The work referred to is normally quoted as Τὰ πρὸς Ἀδαῖον καὶ Ἀντίγονον (Ath. 462a etc.; Suid. α 594 Adler), sometimes as Τὰ πρὸς Ἀδαῖον (Ath. 497f etc.), and as Τὰ πρὸς Ἀντίγονον (Ath. 474c).

Polemon's interest in Hipponax appears from Ath. 698bc, where Polemon ascribes to him the invention of epic parody and quotes fr. 128 W. = 126 Deg., but we do not know if his discussion of the word σαννάς in Crete was connected with Hipponax.

7-9 In these lines the Cretan σαννάδες and the abusive nature of the name Σάννος will have been linked; the link is either their dumbness (τὰς δὲ αἶγας...ἀ]ποπλήκτους εἶναι, Lobel; cf. the following remark on τοὺς εὐή[θεις) or their sexual behaviour (...σανν]ιοπλήκτους εἶναι, Vogliano; καὶ ναι|[αδολήπτους, West—the latter epithet is West's own creation, the former is found only in Hsch. σ 173 Schm. and *P. Oxy*. 3329 fr. 1 16 and as a probable poeticism is not likely to occur in a commentary, unless it is a very terse reference to the etymological relation of Σάννος and σάννας with τὸ σάννιον = τὸ αἰδοῖον. In itself,]ιο is a perfectly possible reading). Though it might appear evident to some of us that the name Σάννος was chosen for its sexual connotations (Masson, 166 and n. 1), it seems, on balance, that the commentator interpreted it as 'dunce', as Aristophanes

of Byzantium (ap. Miller, *Mélanges* 427,1; Eustath. 1761,21ff.; cf. Pfeiffer, 198f.) explained σάννας (cf. ad 10-11). Latte's supplement ἐπὶ | [τῷ πάντοτε ἀ]ποπλήκτους εἶναι is unlikely, because it explains why the goats are called after dunces instead of the other way round. West's ἐπί | [σταται (sc. Polemon) is better, but his construction (first an infinitive, then a participle) is indifferent Greek. I can think of nothing better than ἐπι | [φέρουσιν ("they adduce as explanation") or, alternatively, ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον. ναι- is perhaps the beginning of an otherwise unattested word related to ναισιελία (Hsch. ν 37 Latte, glossed ἀποπληξία, ἐμβροντησία); alternatively, ⟨ἀ⟩ναι | [σθήτους] (Deg., cf. Hsch. α 6544 Latte).

9-10 "And in [everyday] life [we call] simpletons [this]" is the most natural interpretation, given εὐή | [θεις (Lobel in *P. Oxy.* xix, p. 153). The letter preceding μεν in 10 is either σ or ε; ἴσμεν (Latte, who was misled by the photograph and read ἴζμεν) is not unattractive, but I have thought of nothing suitable (Latte's τοὺς εὐή | [θεις λέγεσθαι ἴ]σμεν leaves out the necessary complement of the name given; the same goes for West's τοὺς εὐή | [θεις ἐπιπεφημι]σμέν[ους). Perhaps τοὺς εὐή | [θεις τόδε ὠνομα]σμέν[ους] (object of ἐπι[φέρουσιν: "and from everyday life they adduce the simpletons who have this nickname"). Before καὶ, ὁμοίως (Latte); ἴσως (Deg.).

10-11 I see no possible supplement that can explain why the commentator goes on to quote line 1 of Hipponax' epode again, suppresses line 2 (and maybe some more) and extends his quotation with the apodosis. West's ἀ]λλ' οὐδὲ τοῦ | [το ἀλλά φησι]ν borders on drivel. I hesitantly submit φα]λλοῦ δὲ τοῦ | [το ὄνομά ἐστι]ν (to wit, σάννος, of which only the diminutive σάννιον is attested). The lacuna in l. 10 between μεν[and]λλου is wide enough to contain [ουσφα]. If I am right, the commentator was aware of the sexual origin of the name Σάννος (it would have been surprising if he was not), but knew that as a nickname it meant 'dunce'. To explain this meaning he referred to the dumb wild goats of Crete, to the use of the word (or derivations) for simpletons in colloquial speech, and added the primary meaning 'penis' as an afterthought.

11-14 Lemma again; with at least the line καὶ γαστρὸς οὐ κατακρατέεις left out (cf. *Notes to the Poem(s)*, ad I 3-4). τοὺς was recognized by Maas (ap. Fraenkel). In 12f. ὦ | [ ].ν is normally, and naturally, taken as part of the lemma; West thinks it a paraphrasis of τούς μοι παράσχες (ὦ | [Σάννε, ἄκουσο]ν), but the commentator seems still to be explaining line 1 (the phrase ῥῖνα θεόσυλιν) in 14, so a paraphrase of line 3 in 12f. is not very plausible.

14 ἱερόσυλιν was recognized by Maas (the microscope suggested . ερο.υλιν to me).

15 Lobel's χο is slightly less probable than ι[.]ο—Since no Greek word

fits the bill if one starts from νẹ-, I propose Σά]ννẹ [π]αί[ζ]ọντος αὐτοῦ. Maybe the greater part of 14 and 15 contains the paraphrase of line 1, with a genitive absolute as an explanation ("Hipponax being alluding to..").

16 "Stealing from everywhere (or everyone)?"

18 After]ν, first ẹ or θ̣, then τ̣ or π̣ . τὸ]ν ẹπ̣όμε||[νον (e.g. στίχον)?

II. Fr. 1 col. ii; fr. 118 C W. = 129 C Deg.

The width of the column is determined by Lobel's β[ραχίονας in 8; this supplement, based on 3 βρα[, suggests an average of 30 letters per line (like col. i).

2 The paragraphos indicates the beginning of a lemma which continues until after γαστρίη in 4. The lemma has to be reconstructed (cf. *Notes on the Poem(s)*) from the following commentary, which seems to offer first an explanation of a particular point (of a medical nature), then a paraphrase till πρῶτον (11).

4 A trace of ink after κα; κατ̣[probable.

4-5 Lobel compared Hsch. γ 195 Latte γαστρίαν· στρόφον (colic) ἢ διάρροιαν (Kusterus; διάνοιαν MS.) and suggested [... στρό]|φο[. Latte's [λέγει στρό]|φο[ν καὶ τὴν γ]αστρὸς ἀλγηδό[να entails quotation-end after γαστρίη, which is unlikely; in Luppe's [στρέφηι. στρό]|φο[ς λέγεται ἡ γ]ạστρὸς ἀλγηδώ[ν, the supplement of 4 is far too long; besides the explanation στρόφος κτέ is wrong (στρόφος is not a word for 'belly-ache') and not to the point. Plausible Snell (ap. D.[3]) στρό]|φο[ν λέγει καί γ]ạστρὸς ἀλγηδό̣[να, "he is talking about colic and belly-ache" (in 5, δọ[and δω̣[are equally possible). On the analogy of line 11, we should expect a blank space of one letter to precede στρο]|.

5-8 These lines are usually taken as referring to a customary (εἰώθασι) action, intended to prove (εἰς ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ, cf. Th. II 13,8) something: [οἱ γὰρ σπασ]|μῶι συνεχόμενοι εἰώθασ̣[ι χερσὶ πιέζειν]|τὴν γαστέρα κτέ, Latte; alternatives for σπασμῶι: λιμῶι, Lobel, σκληρυσμῶι Luppe (too long; violates, like σπασ|μῶι, the rules of syllabic division). But it seems better to me to make them describe a usual symptom that points to a certain state of health; this symptom must have something to do with γαστρίη: "Those suffering from (...) are usually (...) in their stomach as an indication of its having been mortified". Perhaps [οἱ γὰρ λι]|μῶι συνεχόμενοι εἰώθασ̣[ιν ἀλγεῖν]| τὴν γαστέρα εἰς ἀπόδ⟨ε⟩ιξιν κτέ. The complementary infinitive after εἴωθα regularly denotes states (e.g. Th. I 99). West is surely wrong in saying (1974, 147) that the commentator "takes [γαστρίη] to mean an insatiable hunger", γαστρίη is rather a consequence of continuous hunger.

7f. ἰδέ was recognized by Maas (ap. D.[3]); νενε]|χρῶσθαι (Lobel) depends from εἰς ἀπόδειξιν: [τοῦ ἀπονενε]|χρῶσθαι Maas (ap. D.[3]), perhaps too long, hence [τοῦ ἀπονε⟨νε⟩]|χρῶσθαι (West) or simply τοῦ νενεχρῶσθαι. It is presumably the stomach which is said to "have been mortified".

9f. ἔφθιν[ται (West) yields a more regular construction ('prolepsis') than ἐφθίν[ου (Latte; if the imperfect can be used at all, its form should be ἔφθινες, but I do not understand why it can). Yet ἔφθινται is a very rare form (A. *Pers*. 679), though its use might have been prompted by a similar form in the lemma. I prefer ἐφθιν[ήκασιν (from φθινάω).

[... ὅσαπερ]| καὶ κατεσθίεις (Latte; ὅποσα Luppe) is probably supposed to mean "no matter how much you eat", but until proof of the contrary has been supplied I refuse to believe it can. West's [...ἀλλά]| καὶ κατεσθίεις is weak, though an adversative relation is certainly attractive. All we need is εἰ]| καὶ κατεσθίεις. Apparently, κατεσθίω is used absolutely. "Look at your arms, he says, and at your neck; they have all wasted away, even though you eat a lot".

10f. Paraphrasis of the last clause of the lemma, but there is no space for γαστρία. Apparently a word more or less synonymous to it (ending in -μος) is used; this may or may not be the same word as the one (ending -μωι) used in 5f. It must also be a very short word, because the verb form beginning κατα̣[must be squeezed in as well. Only λιμός (Lobel) and γέμος (Luppe, rejected by Degani as rare and poetical) meet the latter requirement, neither meets the former. Possibly δηγμός ("biting ache", cf. 5 γαστρὸς ἀλγηδ·[). For the verb, κατα[λάβηι (Lobel) is admirably suited, κατα[κτείνηι (Snell ap. D.[3]) too long. Latte's κατα[λείπει λι]|μός ("perhaps (μή) hunger is leaving you") is possible but cannot paraphrase any part of the lemma.

11-14 Only the beginning of the passage that is paraphrased appears to be quoted as lemma. West thought that the line quoted in 11 is continued by the lemma of 15 (νεῖμον, αὐλήσει κτέ). The paragraphus of 14 is forked (διπλῆ ὠβελισμένη, cf. Turner, 14f. and n. 1) and in 15, the first letter exceptionally large (Turner, 8); these facts suggest a major transition and tell strongly against West's hypothesis.

11 After νε, two uprights that are too close together for an ω (Lobel). νει̣.[is probable, νει̣μ̣[(νεῖμ[ον West) possible. Above the line, a cursive α is more probable than an omikron; it is the first letter either of an explanatory gloss on part of the lemma (cf. II 15) or of a supplementary note (cf. III 2). If we accept νεῖμ̣[ον, παραι]|νεῖ (Lobel) is perfect.

12f. "He exhorts him first to make rhythmical movements... to drink the medicine". χειρονομεῖν is glossed by Pollux (II 153; cf. IV 102) as τὸ ταῖν χειροῖν ἐν ῥυθμῶι κινηθῆναι, but the movements are not necessarily of

the hands or arms (cf. Hdt. VI 129,4; G. J. Woldinga, *Xenophons Symposium*, Hilversum 1938, II 256f.; L. Robert, *Hellenica* 11-12, 1960, 441f.). "χειρονομεῖν probably consisted of a series of rhythmical movements, especially of the arms, and served as propaedeutics for all kinds of intricate dances or of gymnastics" (Woldinga; my translation). χειρονομ[ήσαντι τὸ]| (Latte) or χειρονομ[εῖν εἶτα τὸ]| (Slings).

13f. ποιεῖν in both lines is corrected to πιεῖν (an oblique stroke through, and a point above, the omikron); the second correction must be a mechanical error. "Because [in this way] the medicine works easily and spreads easily through the body" (cf. LSJ, s.v. ἀναδίδωμι, III 2). ἀναδοθ[ῆναι (Latte) is more regular after ποιεῖν than ἀναδοθήσεσθαι (West)—considerations of space are unimportant: if the scribe thought that a major transition was in order after 14, he may also have left blank the space of a couple of letters. ἀναδοθήσεται (Lobel) is unlikely. The infinitive ποιεῖν marks the clause as a paraphrase of words of Hipponax. After γὰρ, a trace consistent with σ or ε, perhaps ο: ọ[ὕτως τὸ (West after Latte's οὕτω τὸ) is probable.

15 τὸ Κωδά[λου μέλος (Latte) glossed by a supralinear τὸν Κωδάλου [νόμον (Latte; the name of Kodalos had been recognized by Lobel). After μέλος, there is room for a filler, not for Latte's παρα]|σκευ[άσα]ι.

16 σκευ[άσα]ι supplied by Lobel; ϰ̣[(Latte, proposing ϰ̣[ελεύει, ἵνα) probable. However, I do not understand δὲ at the beginning of an explanation, unless σκεύασαι is meant. σκευάζω is typically used either of preparing draughts or of attiring persons; preferably the latter.

III. Fr. 3 + 4 + 5 (cf. *P.Oxy.* xviii, p. 184) (fr. 118 B W. = 129 B Deg.). Again, circa 30 letters to the line. For its place, cf. *Notes to the Poem(s)*.

2f. λαιμᾶι - ἐρωδιοῦ: lemma, supplied by Lobel on the basis of a quotation (and of line 11). In the interlinear note Degani recognized a reference to the hollow between underlip and chin (LSJ, s.v. νύμφη VII). Perhaps λέγει τὴ]ṿ δὴ νύμφην τὸ η̣[rather than]ṿ δη(λοῖ) etc. The note in the right-hand margin, if not a continuation of the other one, may contain another explanation of χẹ[ῖλος.

3f. Etymology of λαιμᾶι suggested by [ἀπὸ] τοῦ λαιμοῦ (suppl. Lobel, *P.Oxy.* xviii, 184; cf. Schol. Ar. *Av.* 1563 (λαῖμα) παραπεποίηκε δὲ παρὰ τὸ λαιμόν): ὡς ἀν|[αι]δ̣ῶς ἔτ̣ρ̣[ωγ]ẹ λέγει Latte (ετ̣ρ̣[is not perhaps to be excluded but definitely unlikely; besides, one expects ἀ|ναιδῶς): ὥσαν|[τος β]ρ̣ώσεις [ἃς] ἔλεγε[ν D.[3] (the supplement at the beginning of 4 is too long and σ[is out of the question). After ει̣ in 4, the lower half of a vertical stroke and a dot of ink to the right half-way the line: η̣ or ṿ, possibly ẹ. Perhaps ὥσαν|[εἰ β]ρ̣ω̣σεί̣ẹ[ιν] ἔ̣λεγε[ν "as if Hipponax had said 'to crave

for food''. Alternatively, ὡς ἀν||τί (Führer, private communication). The interlinear note may be supplied κ(αὶ) μα[ιμᾶι, an (erroneous) indication that λαιμάω and μαιμάω are exchangeable variants (cf. the statement about λαιμώσσω and μαιμώσσω in the Nicander Scholia quoted in *Notes to the Poem(s)*, III).

4-8 A learned exposé about the ἐρωδιός. ''The bird ἐρωδιός is rapacious, hence Athena sends this bird of omen to Odysseus and his companion in the *Doloneia* [K 274f.], namely because they intended to rob...'' Supplements by Lobel (*P.Oxy.* xviii, p. 184) but for the second of the three gaps in 5, where his ἐρωδιό[ς ἐστι] is too long, as is Latte's ὅθεν for ἐστι. Probably διὸ.

4 Cf. Schol. T ad Hom. K 274f. (III 58,1 Erbse) καὶ ἁρπακτικόν ἐστιν; Hermon of Delus (Powell, p. 251; on the ἐρωδιός) μάλα γὰρ πέλεται νικηφόρος ὄρνις· ἔς τε βοηλασίην ὁρμωμένωι ἢ ἐπὶ λείην ἄρμενος.

5f. τοῖς περὶ τὸν 'Ο|δυ[σσ]έα: οἱ περὶ plus personal noun in the accusative denotes ''X and his company'', ''X and his companion'' or ''X'' (cf. S. L. Radt, ZPE 38, 1980, 48-52). Cf. Schol. A Hom. K 299 (III 64,10 Erbse) τῶν περὶ 'Οδυσσέα (= Odysseus and Diomede).

6 Νυκτηγρεσία or Νυκτεγερσία (''Night-watch'') is an ancient name for the first part of Book 10 of the *Iliad* (cf. Crates of Mallos ap. Str. IX 5,18; T. W. Allen, *Homeri Ilias*, II, Oxonii 1931, p. 269); in its first quoted form, the word was hitherto only found in Latin authors.

8 After δηλονότι (δῆλον ὅτι), π[most likely, γα[(Lobel) possible. τὰ[ὅπλα ὅτε ἔκτανον (?) Δόλω]|να (D.[3]) is attractive but almost certainly cannot be read; sentence-end after δηλονότι is a good possibility.

9f. ''Precisely as (the ἐρωδιός is said to be rapacious?)''. Either καί γε or γει- = γῑ- (cf., conversely, II 7 ἀπόδιξιν).

10 παλ interpreted by Lobel as Παλαμήδης (of Elea; date unknown but earlier than Athenaeus. A commentary of Pindar and works on lexical problems, Τραγικὴ λέξις, Κωμικὴ λέξις and 'Ονοματολόγος, are ascribed to him; cf. PWRE s.v. Palamedes 3)); for the practice of abbreviating names of scholars, cf. the examples given by Turner, 110 (nr. 65). No other ancient scholar known to us has a name that can be abbreviated in this way. Speculations as to what Palamedes wrote (Lobel δὲ εὖ, for δέ σοι: unlikely; West ὡς ἐρωδιός, hesitantly) might easily be multiplied: σευ (σου), ὡς ἐρωδίωι, ἐρωιδιοῦ, ὥσπερ 'ρωδιοῦ (cf. fr. 16,2 W. = 23,2 Deg.). Perhaps the repetition of ὡς ἐρωδιοῦ in 11 (followed by ω[= ὡ[ς?) suggests a syntactic variant: ''Palamedes wrongly writes ὡς ἐρωδιός (-ιῶι)'': ὡς ἐρωδιοῦ ὡ[ς ἐρωδιοῦ χεῖλος δῆθεν.

10f. [...οὐκ]|εὖ (Latte) is probable. [καίπερ οἱ πλεῖστοι]|εὖ ὡς ἐρωδιοῦ D.[3] implies that Palamedes wrote ἐρωδιόν, which is not likely.

11f. ὡ[ς καὶ...Εὐφρόνι]|ος ἐκτιθεὶς τὰ π[οιήματα D.[3]; π[is possible,

as are ν̣[and (perhaps) η̣[and χ̣ [. -ος may be the remnant of the name of an ancient scholar (neither ἐκτιθεὶς nor καθηγησαμεν̣[implies a commentary on Hipponax), or it may be the relative pronoun opening a new sentence (referring to Palamedes?).

12 An upright arrow in the left-hand margin, possibly an *ancora* (suggested to me by J. Rea; cf. Turner, 18), marking an omission.

14 "This island" was probably the Διομηδεία νῆσος, well-known for its ἐρωδιοί (Lobel), who were Diomede's transformed companions (Ael. *NA* I 1; Verg. *Aen.* XI 271-274; cf. Thompson, 88-91).

IV. Fr. 2 + 8 + not-numbered fr. of *P. Oxy.* 2176—cf. *P. Oxy.* xix, p. 153— + *P. Oxy.* 1233, fr. 29—cf. *P. Oxy.* xviii, p. 184f. (fr. 118 E W. = 130 Deg.).

1]. . [illegible;]. [σ or ε.

2-5 Lobel's supplements (*P. Oxy.* xviii, p. 185). Latte saw here a contrast between a normal way of disposing of the bodies of those put to death and the special way described by Hipponax ("auctum scilicet et in crudelius fictum", 44 n. 1); there is at any rate a contrast between normal burial and the treatment dealt with here: this is the only possible way of accounting for νῦν δέ. Fraenkel (54) drew attention to the fact that τρ[ιτα]ῖον... μιν is an iambic trimeter (no doubt this had been observed by Lobel); this line must be a lemma, because although τριταῖον ἐκ κήρυκος may be part of the paraphrasis (it construes well with the sentence introduced by νῦν δέ), ἀσμε[ν...]έ μιν is not. There is, however, no blank space preceding the lemma, as in II 11, and on the analogy of I 11, I submit that the reason for this is that the line τριταῖον...μιν had already been quoted before. See below, ad 4ff.

2f. Usually understood as "...eux, suffisamment longtemps, jusqu'à ce que le corps se refroidisse" (Masson 1949, 312). But Latte's χρόνο[ν ἱκανὸν] is definitely too short and I have grave misgivings about Lobel's ἕως τ[ὸ: (1) after ω, I think the traces exclude σ; there is, besides, a trace of ink between two vertical strokes that is not explained by the reading στ[. (2) "until" requires the aorist, not the present, subjunctive (ἄν is indeed frequently omitted after ἕως in later Greek). I can see only one way of accounting for the traces after ω, to wit μ̣[(I no longer believe α̣.[to be possible). The thought expressed may be something like: "(they place them on...) for (a certain) time (so that) the body may grow cold". If the text really deals with scapegoats (cf. *Notes to the Poem(s)*), the bodies may have been laid on a pyre of wild wood, as mentioned by Tzetzes, or on a heap of refuse, as in Athens (Eup. fr. 120 K. Cf. Bergk's note on Hippon. fr. 9,1). If so, perhaps ἐπὶ χρόνο[ν ἵνα τὸ ἐν τῷ] θωμ̣[ῶι]| [σ]ῶμα ψύχη-

ται. If not, we may think of origanum and broken vinetwigs, on which the body was laid out before the funeral (Ar. *Eccl.* 1030f. with Van Leeuwen's note)—perhaps the commentator thought that these were meant to cool the body.

3f. "In this case, they throw (the body) out on the sand of the seashore". Probably an echo of the preceding lemma, now lost; cf. *Notes to the Poem(s)*, IV 1.

4ff. If the hypothesis about the repetition of this lemma is correct, it follows that what precedes it is not necessarily a commentary to an earlier line, but possibly to a later one. Indeed, while until 10 this lemma is commented on, from 15 onwards there are repetitions of matter discussed in 1-4 (15 ἐγ]γὺς τῆς θα||[λάσσης; perhaps 16 σῶμα: 17 ἐκβά]λλουσι; 20 τὸ]ν νεκρόν).

5f. "On the third day, he brought him to (or: for) the very (...)". ἤν]εγκεν Lobel; ἤνεγκεν Latte; ἐξήνεγκεν Deg. (referring to the ἐκφορά on the third day, cf. fr. 68,2 W. = 66,2 Deg.; it is possible to read ἐ[ξήν]εγκεν); perhaps πρ]ο[σήν]εγκεν. πρ[..] can hardly be anything but πρός (West *Del.*)—reasons of space and syntax exclude πρίν. τριταῖος was connected by Masson (1949, 318 and n. 2) with the custom of carrying out the body for burial on the second day after death (Ant. 6,34; lex Solon. apud D. 43,62; Pl. *Lg.* 959a; Plu. 563d; Philostr. *VA* III 38; Ant. Lib. 39,5)—the adjective τριταῖος is often used in this connection (Pl.; Plu.; Philostr. *ll.cc.*). If the assumption is valid, αὐτὰ τὰ ἀνδρ- must denote either a place where a ritual in some way related to a funeral was held, or (perhaps better) such a ritual itself (cf. Plu., *l.c.*, καὶ τριταῖος ἤδη περὶ τὰς ταφὰς αὐτὰς ἀνήνεγκε—see further *Notes to the Poem(s)*). Unlikely West *Del.* πρ[ὸς] αὐτὰ τὰ ἀνδρ[ο|βόρα κήτη..., cf. *Notes to the Poem(s)*, 2. The subject of -ήνεγκεν is, presumably, the herald.

7 Before π,]ν (Lobel) is unlikely; perhaps]ο. πρὸ[ς] κήρυ||[κος Fraenkel (54 n. 2), stating that it explains ἐκ κήρυκος of the lemma; if so, the meaning is apparently "at the hand of" (a passive verb is unlikely). But in 10, ἐκ κήρυκος is used, and the κῆρυξ appears to be subject in line 6. Possibly a form of προσκηρύσσω (only a future or aorist form will do because of the syllabic division) or of προσκηρυκεύομαι.

8-11 A parallel ritual, it would seem. "also in the" (name of festival or city?) ..."(dis)similar to". If so, it is unlikely that ἐκ κήρυκος in 10 is a renewed quotation.

8 I disagree with West that κἂν "poetam sapit": even in scholarly prose, crasis is a frequent enough phenomenon.

9]ν not quite certain. δαρ||[τός? There is a φαρμακός story about the Spartan Pherecydes, who sacrificed himself; he was flayed and his skin was preserved by the kings, according to an oracle (Plu. *Pelop.* 21; cf. the mythical examples adduced by Bremmer, 302).

10 Suppl. Lobel.

12 At fr. 103,6 W. = 106,6 Deg., D.[3] proposed κα]τανήσαντο (from κατανέω, "to pile up"). It is hardly more than a coincidence that 12 and 15 of our fragment tally with lines 6 and 7 of that one (cf. ad 15); there is no room, in fr. 103 W. = 106 Deg., for the (obviously Hipponactean)]ντες ἆσσον of 13; a quotation or discussion of fr. 103 W. = 106 Deg. by our commentator may be confidently excluded. Both places seem to deal with a ritual on the sea-shore, but ἐγγὺς in line 15 is probably a reflex of ἆσσον in 13.

13 Cf. *Notes to the Poem(s)*, IV 3. Not a new lemma (cf. ad 4ff.).

14]ṭ or]γ; ἔνιοι] γράφου|[σι West.

15f. ἐγ]γυ̣ς Lobel, comparing 103,7 W. = 106,7 Deg. ἐ]γγὺς τῆς θαλά(σσ)[η]ς (here |[λάσσης Masson 1949, 312), but cf. ad 12.

16]γ or]ṭ, perhaps]ẹ;]σ̣ῶμα not excluded.

17 suppl. Masson.

18 Proper name in -άνωρ or -τωρ?

19]ο̣ς possible. Perhaps "revision, edition" (cf. 14; 22).

20 Probably τὸ]ν.

21 Uncontracted forms of ὀστοῦν are normal in Κοινή Greek and the hiatus excludes a quotation.

22 Aristophanes' name recognized by Lobel. It is probably the grammarian, who, apart from treating the word σάννας (cf. ad I 7-9), is our source for fr. 114b W. = 134 Deg. and one of them for fr. 103,11 W. = 106,11 Deg. The surrounding line-ends suggest that he is here quoted as an authority for a ritual.

23 πολ[υ]ανδρεῖ|[ον (or another case): a normal late Greek term (also πολυάνδριον) for a common burial-place.

24 Before the omikron, λ̣ or α̣.

25 ει deleted in the same way as in II 13f. Circumflex accent over η added later, presumably by the corrector.

26-32 I owe some readings to J. Rea and R. Coles, who graciously helped me decipher the difficult script of this note.

26 Αἴγ]ιναν, cf. 28; ṭ[or σ̣[.

27 Doubtless φ(ησί) or φ(ασί).

28]α̣ or]·α̣; the Aeginetans are probably mentioned for yet another parallel custom or ritual.

29 Both δει and δαι possible; Lobel's δη( ) excluded. Probably δεῖ γράφ[ειν (referring perhaps to τὸ τίνυσ(θαι) of 32).

30 "Is being said of"?

31 ἀπ̣[οδεκτέον? "One must certainly not (οὐδέ) accept this (reading?)".

32 I cannot decide between τίνυσαι and τίνυσ(θαι). In either case it is probably a word cited from Hipponax. It is the last word of the note.

Hipponactean fragments:

I 1 Ὦ Σάνν', ἐπειδὴ ῥῖνα θεό[συλιν φορέ]εις
καὶ γαστρὸς ο̣ὐ καταχρα̣[τέεις,
τοὺς μοι παράσχες ὦ [◡ – × – ◡].ν·
4 σύν τοί τι β̣ουλεῦσαι θέ[λω.

II 1 τοὺς⸥ βρα[χίονας
καὶ τὸ⸥ν̣ τ̣ρ̣ά̣χ⸤ηλον
κατ̣[εσθί-
4 μ̣ή σε γαστρίη [λάβ-

*

πρῶτον μὲν ἐκδὺς νει̣.[

*

αὐλήσει δέ σοι
7 Κίκων τὸ Κωδά⸤λου̣ [μέλος

III λαιμᾶι δέ σοι τὸ ⸤χεῖ⸥λος ὡς ⸤ἐρω⸥διοῦ

IV 1 (ἐπὶ ἄμμον θαλασσίαν ἐκβάλλουσι)

*

τρ⸤ιτα⸥ῖον ἐκ κήρυ[κο]ς· ἀσμ̣ε̣[ν...]έ μιν

*

]ντες ἄσσον

*

4 τίνυσ(θ)αι

Notes to the Poem(s)

Hipponax' authorship was clear from the beginning because III was already known. Lobel saw that none of the lines quoted is demonstrably choliambic, Fraenkel (and independently, Latte), that the structure is epodic (καὶ γαστρὸς οὐ καταχρατέεις and σύν τοι τι βουλεῦσαι θέλω cannot possibly be the beginnings, and are unlikely to be the ends, of iambic trimeters). Since all lines and parts of lines preserved can be fitted into either an iambic trimeter or an iambic dimeter, it is beyond reasonable doubt that at any rate for I-III the scheme is identical to that of Archilochus' "First Epode".

Masson (1949), followed by Adrados (fr. 118) and Galiano (88) analyzed all poetical remains as part of only one poem; Medeiros and Degani

make IV a separate fragment, while most other scholars refrain from passing judgment. It seems certain that I, II and III belong to the same poem, and that I gives its opening lines (these lines are imitated by Callimachus, also in the first lines of a poem). See below, ad II 6f.; III; IV.

I (fr. 118,1f.; 5f. W. = 129 a Deg.)

I 1-4 Cf. Call. fr. 195 ("Iambus V"), 1-2: ὦ ξεῖνε, συμβουλὴ γάρ ἕν τι τῶν ἱρῶν (cf. I 4), ἄκουε τἀπὸ καρδίης (cf. I 3). Callimachus improved on his example by replacing Hipponax' pure trimeters with choliambics. Assuming that Σάννος is a nickname, the parallel ὦ Σάνν'—ὦ ξεῖνε is instructive: both poets remain silent on the names of their targets. Cf. W. Bühler in: *Archiloque*, 236-241.

I 1 Σάνν': The commentary derives this from Σάννος, a name attested in inscriptions (Masson, 165). In principle, it could also be an elided Σάννᾰ (cf. Λυκάμβα, Κανδαῦλα), but the form Σάννης is not attested. What is attested is the word σάννας (Crat. fr. 337), which, if not an error in our sources for σαννᾶς (cf. G. Björck, *Das alpha impurum*, Uppsala 1950, 49) is best regarded as a paratragic creation like γεννάδας, κατωφάγας etc. (Björck, 51-54; 274f.)—in the former case, the vocative cannot be elided, in the latter, we should not expect such a creation to occur in Hipponax, and it seems best to follow the commentator.

We have no way of checking the commentator's (implied) allegation that Σάννος is a nickname (possible parallels in Hipponax: Metrotimos, fr. 122 W. = 193 Deg. and Eurymedontiades, fr. 128 W. = 126 Deg.); there is no real evidence for Masson's hypothesis (1949, 301f., recanted in his edition, 163 n. 1) that Bupalos is meant. If it is a nickname, the connection with σάννιον does not necessarily imply sexual abuse: in many languages slang-words for the penis are used to abuse persons for clumsiness or stupidity. In this case, the commentary is backed up by Aristophanes of Byzantium (σάννας· ὁ μῶρος, cf. *Notes to the Commentary*, I 7-9); Hsch. σ 175 Schm.; *P. Oxy.* 3329 fr. 117 σάννορος· μῶρος = Rhinthon fr. 23 Kaibel; D.L. X 8 (Epicurus called) Δημόκριτον Ληρόκριτον καὶ Ἀντίδωρον Σαννίδωρον = fr. 4 Us. (presumably for his stupidity). Compare Σάθων, which was Antisthenes' nickname for Plato (D.L. VI 16), but at the same time a real personal name (e.g. Arr. *An.* I 12,7).

ῥῖνα θεόσυλιν: This probably means that "Sannus" is a βωμολόχος, one who steals food from altars (Latte, 45 n. 1; Masson 1949, 302f.); one may note Hsch. β 1389 Latte βωμολόχος· ...ἱερόσυλος. Masson (1949, 302) deduced from the fragments (combined with Istros, FGrHist 334F50: a certain Pharmacus had been stoned to death by Achilles for stealing objects (not food) belonging to Apollo, hence the expulsion and

stoning of φαρμακοί) that "Sannus" is described as a future scapegoat, but cf. ad II 6f.; IV. Alternatively, West (1974, 143) takes ῥίς as a metaphor for "penis", as he does in Hippon. fr. 78,14 W. = Deg. and fr. 25 W. = 22 Deg.; there is no support from other ancient authors and no compelling reason for adopting this interpretation in any of the three places (cf. Degani, Gnomon 52, 1980, 514). What might a sacrilegious penis be?

θεόσυλιν: Female form of θεοσύλης (Alc. fr. 298 [= *E*],18 V.; ad. iamb. 35,10 W.); cf. θεοσυλέω (Alc. fr. 298,5 V.) and perhaps θεοσυλ]ίαν (Alc. fr. 59b3 V., glossed ἀντὶ τοῦ ἱεροσυλ[ίαν). Since this compound is now firmly established for archaic Greek, which it was not at the time of the first publication, other supplements may be discarded, given the commentator's paraphrase ἱερόσυλιν.

φορέεις: The normal word to use when parts of the body are qualified, cf. Hdt. III 12,4 ἰσχυρὰς φορέειν τὰς κεφαλάς...ἀσθενέας φορέουσι τὰς κεφαλάς; Semon. fr. 7,65; LSJ s.v. φορέω I 3.

2 γαστρὸς...κατακρατέεις: Cf. Anon. κ.αἰσχρ. 90 (p. 135 D.[3]) γαστρὸς κατίσχω; Chares fr. 3,5 Diehl-Young ὅστις δὲ γαστρὸς μὴ κρατεῖν ἐπίσταται; cf. Diog. Sinop. 88F6,2 *TGF*; Pl. *Lg.* 840c6 uses κατακρατεῖν of (in)continence in sexual affairs. See further Archil. fr. 124b4; Hippon. fr. 128,2 W. = 126,2 Deg.

3-4 The line from III was placed here by Maas (ap. D.[3]), apparently because it makes good sense in the ἐπειδή-clause. Since the lemma of I 11-14 leaves out line 2 anyway (and may have left out more), after which the commentator goes on to explain, apparently, ῥῖνα θεόσυλιν, this proposal is possible. On the other hand, an equally good case can be made for connecting III with II (a reference to Sannus' gluttony is preceded or continued by one to his meagre appearance); as it is not even certain that III is to be placed underneath I or II, it seems safer not to follow Maas.

3 τοῦς μοι παράσχες: Cf. Pl. *Smp.* 216a3 παρέχειν τὰ ὦτα; *Crat.* 396d6; Luc. *Bacch.* 5; *Salt.* 6; Theogn. 887 ἀν' οὖς ἔχω; A. fr. 126 Radt.

ὦ [καταρητὸν κακό]ν: Latte's supplement, of which he himself writes (41) "quod e.g. posui supplementum..., urbanius et mitius convicium est, quam quod Hipponactem scripsisse verisimile sit". It is perhaps too long.

4 For the tmesis, cf. West 1974, 108. It may have been intended to heighten the stylistic level: tmesis is not found in Archilochus' poems in iambic trimeters, in Hipponax it occurs only once (fr. 25 W. = 35 Deg.) in choliambics (apart from cases where only a particle intervenes).

συμβουλεύω: Seems to occur here for the first time in Greek literature; originally the simplex was used in this meaning (LSJ s.v. βουλεύω II; Theogn. 1101).

Cf. Sapph. fr. 137,1 θέλω τί τ' εἴπην. Here too, τί τοι would have been normal word-order, cf. ad. ia. 7,4; Anacr. fr. el. 1 W.; Archil. 185,1; Theogn. 833; 859; 960; 1192; 1300; Mimn. 7,2; only Theogn. 857 μέ τι is comparable. Perhaps τοι is the adverb. Cf. ad III, σοι.

II (fr. 118,7-12 W. = 129c-e Deg.).

1-4 Since Latte, the lemma of lines 2-4 of this column has always been arranged as trimeter-dimeter-trimeter:

τοὺς] βρα[χίονας
καὶ τὸ]ν̣ τ̣ρ̣ά̣χ[ηλον – ∪ –]
κατ̣[–∪–⏑̲] μ̣ή σε γαστρίη [∪ –

However, the reverse arrangement is equally possible:

⏑̲ – ∪ τοὺς] βρα[χίονας
καὶ τὸ]ν̣ τ̣ρ̣ά̣χ[ηλον – ∪ –]κατ̣[– ∪ –
⏑̲] μ̣ή σε γαστρίη [∪ –

It is not quite clear what is the matter with Sannus. Hippocrates mentions colic (στρόφος) and diarrhoea as the result of over-eating (*VM* 10), which is Sannus' main characteristic, but over-eating does not normally result in emaciation of the body. West (1974, 147) compares Erysichthon, who was punished by Demeter with a ravenous hunger (Call. *H.* 6,66), never to be satiated (89f.), until at last only his skin and bones were left (93). Indeed, Sannus' hunger seems to come in the same class: its proportions are exaggerated, perhaps even mythical. Hipponax may have been alluding to Erysichthon's story, which was told in the pseudo-Hesiodean *Catalogue* (fr. 43 M.-W.) and by Hellanicus (4F7), though the emaciation is found only in Callimachus.

1f. Supplied by Lobel. The commentator's paraphrase ἰδέ σου κτέ (8f.) suggests an imperative (ἰδέ or ἰδού D.[3], meaning ἴδου or ἰδοῦ) and a form of φθίνω (ἔφθισο Snell; West's ἔφθισαι is better as it refers to a present state); perhaps a participle best explains the prolepsis ἰδέ...τοὺς βρ. καὶ τὸν τρ. ὅτι ἐφθινήκασιν (if correctly supplied), but no perfect (middle) participle of φθίνω is attested elsewhere (ἐφθισμένους?) while φθιμένους does not fit the metre. Alternatively, the commentator's ὅτι ἐφθινήκασιν may reflect an uncoordinated ἔφθιται in his lemma, e.g.: ἴδου δὲ τοὺς] βρα[χίονας καὶ τὸ]ν̣ τ̣ρ̣ά̣χ[ηλον· ἔφθιται (the predicate agreeing with the nearest part of its subject). Latte's νεκρὸς εἶ, placed after τράχηλον, excludes line-end because of Porson's Law (valid also for iambic dimeters, cf. *B* Appendix 2.3.2.); it is based on the commentator's (ἀπο)νενεκρῶσθαι, which, however, refers to the stomach.

The τράχηλος (neck and throat) and βραχίονες (here, presumably, the whole arm) are meant to represent the whole emaciated body, the rest

of which is covered by the garment or garments which Sannus is advised to take off in 5.

3 κατ̣[should probably be supplied on the basis of the commentator's κατεσθίεις (Lobel). Latte's κα[τ' ἡμέρην γὰρ] ἥ σε γαστρίη [δονεῖ is too far from the paraphrase (and the trace before ησε cannot be a ρ). Both West's κατεσθίεις δὲ and Luppe's κατεσθίων περ are acceptable, but one might equally consider [πολλά περ] κατ̣[εσθίων at the end of a trimeter. κατεσθίω without an object is rather odd, though we shall have to accept that the commentator uses it in this way, maybe because Hipponax did.

4]μ̣ή (D.[3]) is likely both graphically and because of μή σε in the paraphrase (if line-end is considered after 3, καὶ] μ̣ή σε κτὲ is an easy guess).

γαστρίη: found only here, Hsch. γ 195 Latte and MPER N.S. XIII, 10,27f. γαστρί[αν ἢ] κινεῖ σπλάνχ[να (here, κινῆι is excluded on metrical grounds). [λάβηι (Snell ap. D.[3]) is a logical supplement, if Lobel's κατα[λάβηι in line 10 is accepted, as I think it should be. For Luppe's [στρέφηι see *Notes to the commentary*. The optative is equally possible, as editors have failed to note hitherto.

5 "First undress and (...)", (then drink the medicine). ἐκδύομαι without object as Ar. *Lys.* 686.

If West's νεῖμ[ον is accepted, χεῖρας is to be supplied; χεῖρας νέμω (cf. πόδα νέμων, Pi. *N.* 6,15) is a (probably poetic) variant of χειρονομέω substituted for it in the commentary (West's alternative explanations (1974, 148) hinge on his erroneous hypothesis that 6 follows 5 directly; cf. *Notes to the commentary*, 11-14). Perhaps νεῖμ̣[ον ὠκέως χέρας. Logically, πρῶτον μὲν will have been answered by κἤπειτα or the like (or just τε). On the strength of the commentator's ποιεῖν (*Notes to the commentary*, 13f.), we may assume that Hipponax then stated that because of the rhythmical movements the medicine would work better. I agree with West (1974, 148), that the passage throws an interesting light on Greek medicine of this period, but I fail to comprehend why "it appears that the emphasis laid on exercise, for example by Herodicus of Selymbria, the teacher of Hippocrates, was nothing new". Herodicus prescribed exercise for keeping fit, Hipponax for quick spread of a draught (comically intended); cf. Pl. *Phd.* 117a.

6f. An unknown grammarian (ap. Ath. 624b = fr. 153 Deg.) names Kikon, Kodalos and Babys as flute-players mentioned by Hipponax. The names are given as examples of the statement that the ancient flute-players had names that were Phrygian and/or δουλοπρεπεῖς (Athenaeus mentions the healing virtues of the Phrygian mode just before, and here the music accompanies action alleged to be healing, but this is probably a coincidence).

Kikon is a favourite butt of Hipponax (fr. 4,1 W. = 3,1 Deg.; 78,7 W. = Deg.; 102,17 W. = 106,17 Deg.). He is a no-good soothsayer (cf. fr. 4a W. = 188 Deg.) and his name is typically that of a slave ("the Ciconian", i.e. Thracian; cf. Masson, p. 106f.); elsewhere (fr. 78) he seems to be involved in a magical rite. "Kodalos' tune" may also be present in a rather corrupt epigram by Hedylus (ap. Ath. 176c = X 9 Gow-Page; cf. Masson 1949, 307). Possibly, Kodalos himself was a glutton like Sannus (cf. fr. 151a W. = 198 Deg.; a *dubium*); he bears a Lycian name (Masson 1949, 307 n. 1). No doubt we are to infer that Kodalos' tune was as rotten as the qualities of its executant (but there is no negative implication in Hedylus). Fr. 153 W. = 146 Deg. mentions a νόμος κραδίης, ascribed to Mimnermus, which was played when φαρμακοί were led out of the city (cf. Bremmer, 313f.); it, too, was probably not very melodious. There can be no question that Sannus is here treated as a φαρμακός, though fr. IV seems to deal with φαρμακοί. But there is of course a parallelism with the φαρμακός fragments: in those fragments, Hipponax wishes for his targets to be treated like φαρμακοί, i.e. to undergo a set of disagreeable rituals; here, Sannus is advised to partake of a healing ceremony (in the presence of Kikon) which involves heavy exercise (not pleasant for a man of Sannus' habits) and a (presumably not well-tasting) potion. The parallelism may have suggested the flute-playing to Hipponax.

7 Cf. Ar. *Pax.* 289 τὸ Δάτιδος μέλος; Epich. fr. 127 Kaibel.

III (fr. 118,3 W. = 129b Deg.)

Fragment III of the papyrus belongs to the same kollema as I-II; so much is proved by the specific angle of the sheets of horizontal and vertical fibres. Lobel says that there is not much doubt that III stood underneath I; the statement is based, presumably, on a reconstruction of the poem, not on papyrological evidence. If the order is I-III-II, as most scholars assume, III renews the reference to Sannus' gluttony after the announcement of advice in I 3-4. For the order I-II-III, it may be argued that the poem may have closed with such a reference after the cure for Sannus' ailment has been exposed; one may compare the First Strassburg Epode (Archil. fr. 79a D.[3] = Hippon. fr. 115 W.; 194 Deg.), where a detailed description of the victim's suffering is followed by a final reference to the victim's wrongdoings (15f.). If so, the other fragments deal with other poems.

At Nic. *Th.* 470 μαιμώσσων the Scholia note: μαιμώσσων ἀντὶ τοῦ ζητῶν καὶ ὁρμῶν· γράφεται καὶ λαιμώσσων ἀντὶ τοῦ πεινῶν, ὡς Ἱππῶναξ· λαιμώσσει δέ σου τὸ χεῖλος ὡς ἐρωδίου (variants for λαιμώσσει: λαιμῶ(ι), λαιμώσσων).

The correction λαιμᾶι was proposed by Schneidewin, cf. Hsch. λ 137 Latte λαιμᾶι· εἰς βρῶσιν ὥρμηται. λαιμάω is frequent in the lexicographers (cf. Hsch. λ 140; Cyrill. λαι 35 Drachmann; Theogn. *An. Oxon.* II 9,21; Phot. *Lex.*, s.v. λαῖμα) but it is not certainly attested elsewhere in literature (cf. Herod. 6,97; An. κ.αἰσχρ. 69 (p. 134 D.[3])). Its meaning is "to be greedy, unrestrained"; more especially "to have a violent desire for food".

σοι pap.: σου Schol. Nic. (σευ Schneidewin). The latter yields more regular syntax, but both the dative and the irregular agreement can be explained as epicisms (Chantraine, II 71f.; 322f.). Alternatively, σοι can be taken as "dativus sympatheticus". The use of σοι as an enclitic (for τοι; cf. I 4) is remarkable, but it is backed up by II 6; cf. *C*, 4 and West 1974, 100.

χεῖλος: Cf. the lip as recipient of food in Pi. *P.* 9,68.

ὡς ἐρωδιοῦ: Comparisons involving animals are particularly frequent in the iambographers: Hippon. fr. 66 W. = 32 Deg.; 79,11 and 16 W. = Deg.; 145 W. = 136 Deg.; 155 W. = 40 Deg.; perhaps 78,5 W. = Deg.; Archil. 23[= *A*],16; 41,1 (?); 43,2; *B* 31; 223; 224; First Strassburg Epode, 11; Semon. 7, *passim.*

Most editors read ἐρωιδιοῦ though the word is written three times without an iota in the papyrus, where iota adscript is normal. The MS. tradition backs up the papyrus here and is divided at fr. 16,2 W. = 23,2 Deg.; etymology seems to prove that the iota is an analogical intrusion (but it may of course have been older than Hipponax). For the identity of the bird, cf. Thompson, 102-104. It is not elsewhere credited with gluttony (but cf. its Modern Gk. name ψαροφάγος); maybe Hipponax associated the heron (if it is meant here) with the wading-bird called χαραδριός (cf. fr. 52 W. = 55 Deg.), which was notorious for it (cf. Pl. *Grg.* 494b). The 'ρωδιός of fr. 16,2 W. = 23,2 Deg. does not fit in with a heron, but obviously Hipponax is imitating the *Doloneia* passus there; it would seem that he did not care overmuch for ornithological precision.

IV (2f. = fr. 118 E W.; 2 = fr. 130 Deg.).

A body is being ritually disposed of on the second day after death; a herald plays a leading part. The scene is the sea-shore where the body is either already lying in the sand, or cast away on the sand. Lobel suspected that these fragments refer to part of a φαρμακός ritual; the hypothesis was worked out extensively by Masson (1949, 311-319). Latte (44 n. 2) rejects it on the ground that the φαρμακός was never killed: this begs the question.

Leaving data from Hipponax aside for the moment, it is evident that

our most reliable sources state or imply that the putting to death of the scapegoat was only symbolical (cf. Bremmer, 301f.; 315-317; G. Murray, *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, Oxford 1911², 32-36; 326-331). It must be noted, however, that some indications about human sacrifices under exceptional circumstances cannot be easily dismissed (Phaenias fr. 25 Wehrli; Plu. *Pelop.* 21; Ps.-Pl. *Min.* 315c), but they have probably little to do with fixed rituals, and none of them is quite beyond suspicion. (For a more or less complete survey of the evidence, see now E. O'Connor-Visser, *Aspects of human sacrifice in the tragedies of Euripides*, Amsterdam 1987, 211-232).

For Hipponax, the evidence is not clear. Tzetzes (*Chil.* V 728-758) gives a description of the ritual based almost exclusively on Hipponactean data. His wording in 731 (τὸν πάντων ἀμορφότερον ἦγον ὡς πρὸς θυσίαν) seems to leave the question open, but in 736f. (τέλος πυρὶ κατέκαιον ἐν ξύλοις τοῖς ἀγρίοις, καὶ τὴν σποδὸν εἰς θάλασσαν ἔρραινον εἰς ἀνέμους) the object is (as the context shows) the victim and not some sort of effigy. However, while he quotes various lines from Hipponax for his statements, he omits to do so for the victim's death. It is possible that Tzetzes' information about the burning is not based on Hipponax at all, but on Lycophron, whom he goes on to quote as a parallel (740 ὡς καὶ Λυκόφρων μέμνηταί που = Lyc. 1157-1159), though Lycophron is not talking about φαρμακοί. The cremation at any rate is supported by Eup. fr. 120 K. (ὃν χρῆν ἐν τε ταῖς τριόδοις κἀν τοῖς ὀξυθυμίοις προστρόπαιον τῆς πόλεως κάεσθαι τετριγότα) and the cremation on wild wood perhaps by D. Chr. 33,63 (for the fig-wood, cf. Bremmer, 312f.); see also Theoc. 24,91-96 (Tiresias prescribes burning the snakes on wild wood and casting the ashes over the river, beyond the border, and returning without looking back; cf. Bremmer, 309; 315). Medeiros (Humanitas 11, 1959-60, 144 n. 21) supposed that fr. 65 W. = 31 Deg. is part of a description of the ashes being dispersed, but evidently Tzetzes (our source for that fragment, too) thought otherwise. The hypothesis that fr. 104,49 W. = 107,49 Deg. refers to a cake in the shape of a man sacrificed instead of the φαρμακός (Murray, *o.c.*, 327) is almost certainly untenable. Fr. 128 W. = 126 Deg. refers to the death of Eurymedontiades (probably a φαρμακός) "on the beach of the endless sea", but the mention made of pebbles (for symbolical stoning? cf. Bremmer, 301; 316; Ael. *NA* XII 34 (on another ritual) λίθοις βάλλεται δημοσίαι καὶ ἔστε ἐπὶ τὴν θάλατταν φεύγει) plus the fact that this is epic parody should make one pause before taking it literally. Likewise, the stoning of Hipponax himself (fr. 37 W. = 46 Deg.) may be symbolical and its relation to the φαρμακός ritual is hypothetical (Masson 1949, 317).

At our place, death is actual, not symbolical, but again it is not certain that the ceremony described is the scapegoat ritual. The major support for

the hypothesis are the words ἐπὶ ἄμμον θαλασσίαν (3f.) and ἐγγὺς τῆς θαλάσσης (15f.) from the commentary: they fit in with Tzetzes' statement that the ashes were strewn into the sea and with Eurymedontiades' death, as well as with numerous other data (cf. Bremmer, 301; 316). There is no mention of either stoning or burning, but the words τριταῖον ἐκ κήρυκος may be explained (and are perhaps best explained) as a reference to an official cremation two days after the stoning. Against this, it must be noted that a three-day period for the φαρμακός ritual does not fit the Thargelia, a two-day festival; on the first day the scapegoats were expelled (Bremmer, 318-320). But then, neither does fr. 6,1 W. = Deg. ἐν χειμῶνι, since the Thargelia were celebrated in the early summer (Bremmer, 301).

An alternative explanation of our fragment was given by Latte (44 n. 2): haec verba potius de capitis damnato accipienda sunt, qui in βάραθρον abicitur, ut Atticum morem conferam. But if so, why the official ceremony on the third day, complete with herald?

On balance, though the data from the papyrus do not exactly tally with all the other extant evidence (nor should we expect them to), I think it likely that we have here the description of the final stage of a φαρμακός ritual. If the assumption is correct, Tzetzes' testimony gains in credibility and the Eurymedontiades fragment must be taken to announce actual, not symbolical death. This does not, I think, imply that Hipponax is describing a ritual that actually took place in his own community every year. Eupolis refers to the death of φαρμακοί, though it is an established fact that φαρμακοί were not killed in Athens. Probably, the Greeks thought that they were in fact killed in the past (cf. Ar. *Ran.* 732 πρὸ τοῦ; Pl. *Min.*, *l.c.*), and Hipponax may have described as actual an aspect of the ritual that was merely legendary.

It is not likely that the victim of the ritual is Sannus (so Masson 1949; cf. ad I 1), although in the case of Eurymedontiades, his gluttony and his death (real or symbolical) as a scapegoat seem to be connected. A φαρμακός treatment in addition to the cure for gluttony described in II is too excessive even in Hipponax. Besides, as Latte (*l.c.*) rightly notes, the third person of IV 2 does not tally with the vocative and second persons of I-III. IV seems to deal with a different poem altogether, not necessarily an epode.

IV 2 is a pure iambic trimeter (these are found occasionally even in the choliambic poems); as fr. 23 of the papyrus (fr. 131 T Deg.) mentions choriambs, we may tentatively infer that the commentary deals with Hipponactean poems in various metres (since there is no example of a line-by-line commentary on texts from different authors, Hipponax' authorship of IV is certain).

1 It has been noted by several scholars that the nexus ἄμμος θαλασσία has a poetic ring; I think that there can be no reasonable doubt that the commentator derived it from Hipponax. Though neither ἄμμος nor θαλάσσιος are specifically poetic words, their combination goes far beyond what may be expected in prose, let alone in this commentator's arid style. There is, besides, a Homeric parallel (unnoticed hitherto): γ 38 ἐπὶ ψαμάθοις ἁλίῃσιν; cf. A. *Pr.* 574 παραλίαν ψάμμον. Adrados wished to place the words directly before 2, and undertook to rewrite them as an iambic dimeter (ἄμμον θαλασσίῃν ἐπί would fit the bill—his proposals do not). Likewise West *Del.*: "possis θινὶ... | βαλοῦσιν ἐν θαλασσίῃι | τρ[ιτα]ῖον" κτέ. Perhaps θαλασσίῃν ἐπ' ἄμμον, beginning a trimeter. It is not improbable that the line containing the nexus came after, not before, IV 2 (see *Notes to the Commentary*, 4ff.).

For the sea-shore as scene for the φαρμακός ritual, cf. above. The sea, being unpolluted (ἀμίαντος, A. *Pers.* 578), is the natural receptacle of filth (cf. *Il.* A 314; E. *IT* 1193 θάλασσα κλύζει πάντα τἀνθρώπων κακά)—the scapegoat is often called κάθαρμα etc. (Bremmer, 304). Cf. also Suid. π 1355 Adler (περίψημα·...καὶ οὕτως ἐνέβαλλον τῆι θαλάσσηι); Phot. *Lex.* s.v. περίψημα.

2 See *Notes to the Commentary*, 4f. τριταῖον ἐκ κήρυκος supplied by Lobel, who read ἄσμε̣[νοι δ]έ μιν. Fraenkel restores ἄσμε̣[νος (noting that "other endings seem equally possible", 54 n. 3); this is preferred by Deg. on the ground that the commentary continues this quotation with a sentence with the herald as subject. However, this sentence seems to explain the words τρ. ἐκ κήρ. only; the herald as subject in a sentence immediately following one ending in ἐκ κήρυκος is not particularly attractive. It is rather the attending population than the herald who is "relieved"; they may also have been subject in the sentence ending in τριταῖον ἐκ κήρυκος ("they brought him, on the third day, led by a herald"). On balance, I prefer ἄσμε̣[νοι. West connects 2 and 3, proposing ἄσμε̣[νοι δ]έ μιν [ἰό]ντες ἆσσον [ἰχθύες, which is highly fanciful.

Both δ]έ μιν and τ]έ μιν (D.³) are possible.

3 Quotation guaranteed on account of the Ionic form ἆσσον; ἰό]ντες (West) plausible. Maybe the procession is approaching the sea.

4 τίνυμαι is the normal Ionic form (cf. Hdt. V 77,1).

APPENDIX

THE SANNUS POEM AND EPODIC STYLE

The theme of the Sannus poem is one of the most common in all iambus. Persons are criticized and ridiculed for their gluttony by Archilochus

(in trochaic tetrameters only: fr. 124, Pericles; fr. 167, Charilaos—both are elsewhere addressees of non-critical poems and apparently friends of the poet), Semonides (fr. 22-23), Hipponax (fr. 26-26a W. = 36-37 Deg.; 128 W. = 126 Deg.; 114c W. = 171 Deg.). But the manner in which the subject is treated here is noticeably different from that of Hipponax' other poems and so is the language. There is no trace here of a parallel to the extensive description of the prodigal squandering his inheritance (fr. 26 W. = 36 Deg.), nor to the baroque, detailed inventory of the food he is missing (fr. 26a W. = 37 Deg.). Nor do our fragments preserve anything similar to the daring verbal creations and comical metaphors of the others (μεσσηγυδορποχέστης, ποντοχάρυβδιν, ἐγγαστριμάχαιραν).

There are indeed two rather unusual metaphors in the Sannus poem (ῥῖνα θεόσυλιν; λαιμᾶι τὸ χεῖλος), but the difference between these and those quoted above is obvious. Also, its language presents a few possible epicisms (I 4 tmesis; III σοι..ἐρωδιοῦ) and other poetical expressions (τοὺς μοι παράσχες; μή σε γαστρίη λάβηι/λάβοι; νεῖμον χεῖρας). The language may be said to have a quiet poetical tone, quite unlike that of the choliambic poems on one hand and of the epic parody on the other.

Now, it may be objected that these are unwarranted generalizations, given the fragmentary transmission of this poem; yet I believe them to be tenable because they fit in precisely with what may be observed in other archaic epodes: the themes are typically iambic but the language is characterized by absence of realistic expressions, frequent use of metaphors, judicious selection of epicisms and poeticisms (I may refer to my analysis of Archilochus' "First Epode" and Cologne Epode, *Studi* I 19,5; II).

The Strassburg Epodes follow suit (see the parallels adduced by Deg. ad fr. 194 and 196); if nothing else, our fragments teach us that Hipponax may be credited with those as well, although there is little evidence to enable us to decide between him and Archilochus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

F. R. Adrados, *Líricos griegos; elegiacos y yambógrafos arcaicos*, II, Madrid 1981[2].
Archiloque, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, X, 1966, Vandœuvres.
Th. Bergk, *Poetae lyrici graeci*, II, Lipsiae 1882[4]
R. Beutler, cf. Diehl.
J. N. Bremmer, "Scapegoat rituals in Ancient Greece", HSCP 87, 1983, 299-320.
P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique*, Paris, I 1973[5], II 1953.
E. Degani, *Studi su Ipponatte*, Bari 1984.
E. Degani, *Hipponactis testimonia et fragmenta*, Lipsiae 1983. [Deg.]
J. D. Denniston, *The Greek particles*, Oxford 1954[2]
E. Diehl, *Anthologia lyrica graeca*, 3 ed. cur. R. Beutler, Lipsiae 1952. [D.[3]]

E. Fraenkel, "An epodic poem of Hipponax", CQ 36, 1942, 54-56 (= *Kleine Beitrage zur klassischen Philologie*, I, Roma 1964, 241-245).
M. F. Galiano, "La lírica griega a la luz de los descubrimientos papirológicos", Actas PCEEC, Madrid 1958, 59-180.
K. Latte, "De nonnullis papyris Oxyrrhynchiis, I. De Hipponactis Epodo", Philologus 97, 1948, 37-47 (= *Kleine Schriften*, München 1968, 468-477).
E. Lobel et al., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, xviii, London 1941. [*P. Oxy. xviii*]
E. Lobel et al., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, xix, London 1948. [*P. Oxy. xix*]
W. Luppe, [review of West 1974], DLZ 96, 1975, 689-692.
P. Maas, "Commentarii in Hipponactem P. Oxy. 2176 fragm. 6", CQ 36, 1942, 133.
O. Masson, "Sur un papyrus contenant des fragments d'Hipponax", REG 62, 1949, 300-319.
O. Masson, *Les fragments du poète Hipponax*, Paris 1962.
W. de Sousa Medeiros, *Hipónax de Efeso*, I, Coimbra 1961.
R. Pfeiffer, *History of classical scholarship*, Oxford 1968.
S. R. Slings, "Studi sugli Epodi di Archiloco", to appear in QUCC.
B. Snell, *Frühgriechische Lyriker*, II, Berlin 1972.
W. d'Arcy Thompson, *A glossary of Greek birds*, London-Oxford 1936[2].
E. G. Turner, *Greek manuscripts of the ancient world*, Oxford 1971.
M. L. West, *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, I, Oxonii 1971. [West; W.]
M. L. West, *Studies in Greek elegy and iambus*, Berlin-New York 1974.
M. L. West, *Delectus ex iambis et elegis Graecis*, Oxonii 1980. [West *Del.*]

E ALCAEUS

'AIAS AND KASSANDRA'

Introduction: 1. *The Papyri*

P.Oxy. 2303 (to which I shall refer as O hereafter) was first published by E. Lobel in 1951. Fragment 1 contains 14 lines. It tells how the Locrian Aias dragged away (?) Kassandra, who had sought protection with the statue of Athena. The goddess took revenge by unchaining a storm.

This fragment seemed to be part of a narrative poem. Page (1955) ranged it with the 'non-political poems', Barner with 'Mythen', though he thought it probable that the myth was a παράδειγμα (201). He was right, as the publication of *P.Colon.* 2021 confirmed. Fr. 298 belongs with the political poems.

The Cologne papyrus (henceforth C) was first published, in 1967, by R. Merkelbach, who took counsel with several prominent scholars (Lobel, Page, Kassel a.o.). It contains 49 lines, spread over two columns. The right-hand column is extremely mutilated and offers at most 8 letters per line. The last three lines of the left column have all but disappeared, but here O comes to our aid.

The first line of O coincides with v. 15 of C. The connection of O 11-13 with C 25-27 is extremely doubtful (cf. the commentary).

Both O and C probably date from the first century A.D. C has some legible scholia and glosses; O once had them, but the traces are totally illegible now. In both papyri we find (partial) accentuation and quantity signs. C even has quite a lot of these signs, but they are, according to Merkelbach (81), in most cases wrongly placed. This is, however, not true, but it must be granted that they are sometimes puzzling and rather superfluous. Why e.g. βε̆λτερον and why κατῆχε? No commentator explains and it seems, indeed, that no ready explanation is at hand.

Now it does not affect our reading of the text that the ε of βελτερον is marked as short, but in the case of α we should like to know whether we can trust the scribe. The quantity of an α is indicated in a total of 31 cases. Only in one of these cases the quantity sign seems incorrect, viz. the brevity mark on the last α of].ανᾰᾰς (v. 9; cf. the commentary). Since there is no other demonstrable mistake, I think we ought to reckon with the quantity signs and not to ignore them when proposing supplements.

Nine years before the Cologne papyrus became known, Merkelbach (1958, 92) suggested that O 2-9 should be connected with fr. 135 (Voigt) = *P. Oxy.* 2165, fr. 6. Barner adopted this suggestion and printed both fragments as a whole. Fr. 135 runs as follows:

π[
πριν[
φώ.[
δείν[
χει.[
ἀλλ.[
]δ̣[
φ[

When editing the Cologne papyrus Merkelbach (89) argued that its contents neither confirmed nor definitely refuted his former supposition and he retains the supplements he once proposed. In this way he succeeds in connecting vv. 18-22 with fr. 135, 3-7, but he notably fails with v. 17. Where 135,2 has πριν, Merkelbach supplies in his 'Lesetext' ἐς ναῦον, and indeed, one does not see how πριν could possibly suit the combined text of O and C. I think, therefore, that we cannot escape the conclusion that the Cologne papyrus *does* refute Merkelbach's former supposition and that fr. 135 cannot be connected with the poem we are dealing with here.

2. *The Myth*

The story of Aias and Kassandra was, according to Proclus, found in the *Iliou Persis*: Κασσάνδραν δὲ Αἴας ὁ 'Ιλέως πρὸς βίαν ἀποσπῶν συνεφέλκεται τὸ τῆς 'Αθηνᾶς ξόανον· ἐφ' ὧι παροξυνθέντες οἱ Ἕλληνες καταλεῦσαι βουλεύονται τὸν Αἴαντα, ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς 'Αθηνᾶς βωμὸν καταφεύγει καὶ διασώιζεται ἐκ τοῦ ἐπιχειμένου κινδύνου (Allen V, p. 108, 2-6).

The *Nostoi* told of Aias' shipwreck and death and, though Proclus does not say so, we may well suppose that Athena brought about this disaster in revenge of Aias' misbehaviour. The story is probably alluded to in γ 143-5 and δ 502. After Alcaeus we find the most telling testimonies in Euripides *Troades* 69-71, Lycophron *Alexandra* 357-397, Libanius *Refutationes* 2 and *Confirmationes* 3 (VIII, 128-135; 150-154 Foerster), Quintus Smyrnaeus XIII, 420-429 and XIV, 419-610 (a long description of the storm) and Schol. AD ad *Iliad* N 66 (= Callimachus *Aetia* fr. 35, since the scholiast informs us that Callimachus told the story in the first book of his *Aetia*). Libanius is the only one who offers the extensive version of the *Iliou Persis*: Aias is brought to trial but escapes to an altar. In *Troades* 71, on the other hand, Athena indignantly remarks: κοὐδέν γ' 'Αχαιῶν ἔπαθεν

οὐδ' ἤκουσ' ὕπο (or: κοὐ δεῖν'; Nauck, followed by Diggle). This statement does not suggest that a trial was held.

Aias' act of violence is represented on several vase-paintings, as well as, according to Pausanias, on the chest of Cypselos (V, 19,5) and on the throne of Phidias' Zeus in Olympia (V, 11,6). Furthermore, paintings by Polygnotus, both in the Poikilè Stoa and in the Delphian Leschè, showed the Greek kings taking counsel together how to react to Aias' outrage upon Kassandra (Pausanias I, 15,2; X, 26,3). Concerning the painting in Delphi Pausanias writes: Αἴας δὲ ὁ 'Οιλέως ἔχων ἀσπίδα βωμῶι προσέστηκεν, ὀμνύμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐς Κασσάνδραν τολμήματος. Unfortunately, Pausanias does not tell us what kind of oath Aias was supposed to swear. According to Robert (1269-70) he vowed to institute the tribute of the Locrian maidens, who afterwards were sent to Troy. This is not probable. Not only do we hear nowhere that Aias himself proposed this redemption, but one may also doubt whether Robert's interpretation is possible in view of the words ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐς Κασσάνδραν τολμήματος. Lloyd-Jones (137) argues that Aias took an oath to deny his guilt. Perhaps he is right, though it is hard to imagine how such an overt crime can successfully be denied. According to Meyerhoff (148, n. 67) Aias may have sworn that he had not violated Kassandra. But that would not undo his insult to the goddess; it could, at the best, satisfy Agamemnon, if we assume that Kassandra, though dragged away by Aias, was afterwards allotted to the supreme king.

It is not really important to the interpretation of Alcaeus fr. 298 what kind of oath was taken by Aias according to Polygnotus or Pausanias. But we may ask whether the trial of Aias formed part of the poem. Some scholars (Rösler, Fowler, Meyerhoff) are convinced this was indeed the case. Their main argument is fr. 306 A h (V.). This fragment is composed of two tiny scraps, ingeniously combined by Lloyd-Jones, of *P. Oxy.* 2506, a papyrus that contains a commentary on Greek lyric poetry by an unknown author (or authors?). It does not offer a line by line commentary. The author seems to have been especially interested in history and biography (cf. 306 A b and e) as well as in questions concerning mythology, music, metre and language (see Barner *AF* 2).

The relevant lines of the fragment read as follows:

> ἀ]λλὰ καὶ τọ̀[ν] ụ̔π̣ὸ τῶṿ[
> Αἴ]α̣ν̣τα κατη⟨ι⟩τιαμένọ[ν
>]α [ἐ]πὶ̣ τῆι̣ Κα̣σσάνδρα̣[ι
>]κ̣αὶ γὰ[ρ] α̣ὐ̣τ̣[ὴν τῶι ἀ]γ̣άλ̣μ̣[ατι (5-9)

In v. 12 Athena may have been named (]ησαθην[).

From these scarce remnants we may indeed gather that Aias was accused and, since Alcaeus is one of the poets the commentator deals with, it seems a fair guess that this piece of commentary has to be related to fr. 298. However, it remains a guess and even if it were not, I see no reason why this fragment should indicate that the trial of Aias formed part of the poem. It is quite possible that the author of the commentary told a more extensive version of the story than that which he found in the poem. Fr. 306 A h cannot be considered conclusive evidence. Whether Alcaeus described the trial can only appear from the poem itself. I shall return to this question in the commentary.

Before presenting my text, I must mention a difficulty I was faced with when constituting the text of this fragment. The photograph of the Oxyrhynchus papyrus, which Mr. R. Coles kindly sent me, was a good one, but nevertheless I was not able to detect all the (traces of) letters that Lobel printed in his first edition. In such a case one hopes that the original will clarify things, but I was convinced that the viewing had to be done by a papyrologist of great experience. Therefore, I ventured to call in the aid of Mr. Parsons. He was kind enough to inspect the papyrus and confirmed at least part of my doubts.

The papyrus has clearly deteriorated since Lobel edited it, and needless to say this sometimes caused me considerable hesitation: should I print what, apparently, could be read by Lobel some thirty years ago or what can still be read now? Where necessary, I have accounted for my decisions in the commentary. Fortunately, the Cologne Papyrus did not cause such problems, Inspection of the original showed me that the photograph, sent to me by the *Institut für Altertumskunde* in Cologne, was really excellent. It seems that the papyrus, with one exception (cf. the commentary ad v. 10), has not been damaged since the first publication. It remains to be said that Mr. Worp generously helped me in examining both photographs.

P. Oxy. 2303

Transcript

fr. 1, a] χ·[
]·[·]ανηλθολ̣·[··]·χων
]·[··]··παλλα[··]·ᾱθε̣ω[
]·ιθεοcύλαιcιπ̣[·]ν̣τ··
]·αμ̣α̣χάρωνπ·φ̣υχε
]·ιδ’α̣·φοινπαρ···ίχᾱν̣·λων
]··ρ̣ε̣cτάχοιcαναγάλματι

]ολ[.]χροcουδ'έδ[.]ιcε
]....ọλέμωδότ[...]αν
]δ̣ε̣δε.νονυπ[.]φρυcιν
]δ̣.ωθειcα..τ'όινοπα
]..δ'ἀφάντοι̣[
]ε̣χυ̣χαθυέλλαιc

fr. 1, b]ν·ᾱ[
]·[
]··[

Text fr. a + b] χ·[

]·[·]αν ἦλθ' ὀλ.[..]ἔ̣χων
]·[..]·· Πάλλα[δ̣ọ]ς, ἃ θ̣έω[ν
]σ̣ι θεοσύλαισι π̣[ά̣]ν̣τω̣ν̣[
]·α μακάρων π[έ̣]φυχε.

]·ι δ' ἄ̣μ̣φοιν παρθ̣ε̣νίχαν ἔ̣λων
]π̣α̣ρ̣εστάχοισαν ἀγάλματι
]ὀ Λ[ọ́]χρος οὐδ' ἔδ[ε̣]ισε
]··· π̣ọλέμω δότ[ε̣ι̣ρ̣]αν

]ν·ά δ̣ὲ̣ δε[ῖ̣]νον ὐπ' [ὄ̣]φρυσιν
π̣[ελι]δ̣ν̣ώθεισα χ̣ὰ̣τ οἴνοπα
πόν]τ̣ọ[ν] ἐ̣χ̣ δ' ἀφάντοι[ς
]ἐ̣χύ̣χα θυέλλαις

P. Colon. 2021

Transcript

]πολεμος
]·υ̣τι
]
] μηνδικα—ταμη.[......].μηενδικ^η κε[.]μενα
]cαντατακαιcχῦν[. . .]ταταμ͡ηδῖχὰ
]ηνδεπερβᾰλον.[..]αγχᾱ τηναγχο̣νη^ν
..[.]c.ω ουτωcειρη
].ενὶλ̣ᾱ̣̀ . ολιωιπ.[..]ᾰν· κεδεcμον
].αχαῖοὶcῆcπ̣ọλ̣υ̣βε̆λτὲρὸν τηναναγκ ην
]..η.[.]¨χατεχτᾰνον θεοcυλ^ηοντ^α
]....εον̣..cαιγαῖc

]. ετυχονθαλαccᾱc·
]ẹνναῦὠπ̣ρ̣ι̣α̣μωπαῖc
]. ανᾰᾰcπολύλᾱΐδοc

]α̣πᾰππενᾱγενειω αφημμενη
]νὲὲcδεπολινέπ̣ὴπὸν
]. . . [. .]. ᾱcδᾱΐφ̣ο̣βονταμᾰ̀
]. νοιμωγαδ[. .]. τ. . χεοc
]ιπαιδωναῦτ̣ᾱ̣
]ο̣νπεδὶὸνκὰτῆχε·
]. ccᾰ̀νῆλθολοᾱνεχων
]. [ ]. νᾱcπαλλᾰδὸcᾱθεων
]οcυλαῖcιπαντων
]. . τᾱπεφυκε·
]ινπαρθενιχᾱνελὼν
]ἀ̣c[α]ῖναγαλματι
]. [ ]˘. ὶcε
]ᾰν
]. ρ̣ὺcι
]
]μελοντοδεενεκε. [. .]
]. . τηνπολινκα. [
] ο̣υα. ο̣ρ[ο]επιλεγομ̣ε̣. [
] χαρινανδροco. [

col. ii

cμ[
. . . [
εξαπ[
αῑδή. [
ῑραῖc. [
αῖᾱcα. . [
ανδρ̣ὸ̣`[ ]. [
. . μ̣ο̣[
. . . ρ. [
εβᾰcχε̣[
παννυχιο̣[
πρωτοι. [
δεινα. [
ᾱΐξὲπο. [
ω. cε̣βι. [
. . . . ι̣cε̣[

π̣α̣ν̣τᾱπ.[
. .].τ̣ο̣. . .[
δ. . .ροcενο̣[
δ̣υ. . δ̣εχαμ[
ζω̣ε̣ιμενω̣.[
ἄτᾱνβροτ.[
ωϋρρᾰδον.[
. . ε.χελητ̣.[
.]. . . . . .ω̣π̣[
. . .

Text

]σαντας αἴσχυν[. . .]τα τὰ μἤνδικα
]ην δὲ περβάλοντ’ [ἀν]άγκα
].ενι λ̣α̣βολίωι π.[. .]αν.

]. Ἀχαίοις ἧς πό̣λ̣υ̣ βέλτερον
]. .η.[.]. κατέκτανον
]. .π̣λ̣έον̣τ̣ε̣ς Αἴγαις
]. ἔτυχον θαλάσσας.

]ε̣ν ναύω⟨ι⟩ Π̣ρ̣ι̣ά̣μω πάις
Ἀ]θ̣ανάας πολυάιδ̣ος
]α̣παππένα γενείω
δυσμέ]νεες δὲ πόλιν ἔπηπον

]. . .[. .]. ας Δαΐφοβον τ’ἄμα
].ν οἰμώγα δ’ [ἀπ]ύ̣ τ[ε̣]ί̣χεος
]ι παίδων ἀύτ̣α̣
Δαρδάνι]ο̣ν πέδιον κάτηχε.

].σσαν ἦλθ’ ὀλόαν ἔχων
].[ ].νας Πάλλαδος ἃ θέων
θε]οσύλαισι πάντων
]..τα πέφυκε.

]ιν παρθενίχαν ἔλων
]ισαν ἀγάλματι
].ισε
].αν

].ρυσι

P. Colon. 2021 16-24 + *P. Oxy.* 2303 2-10

Αἴας δὲ λ]ύσσαν ἦλθ' ὀλόαν ἔχων
]. . .νας Πάλλαδος, ἃ θέων
]σι θεοσύλαισι πάντων
]. .τα μακάρων πέφυκε.

χέρρεσ]σι δ' ἄμφοιν παρθενίχαν ἔλων
]παρεστάχοισαν ἀγάλματι
]ὁ Λ[ό]κρος, οὐδ' ἔδ[ε]ισε
]. . .πολέμω δοτ[ε.ρ]αν

]ν·α δὲ δε[ῖ]νον ὑπ' [ὄ]φρυσι(ν)

Apparatus criticus

Supplements in O that have been proved impossible by the publication of C have been left out. The contributions of scholars whose names are not included in the bibliography can be found in Merkelbach's first publication or in the *Nachträge*. Generally, I only mention the name of the author who first suggested a supplement. If he maintained his suggestion in later publications, I have refrained from further specification.

For the sake of clarity I refer to the linenumbers of O separately.

1]σαντας : δρά]σαντας Merk. δράσαντά σ' Arnott apud M. 1968; αἰσχῦν [. . .]τατᾶμηνδὶκᾶ : αἰσχυν[νέσ]τατα μῆνδιχα Merk., Strunk apud M. αἰσχύν[νον]τα τὰ μῆνδιχα Lobel apud M. ἄισχυν[ν' αὖ]τα τὰ μῆνδιχα Gall. αἰσχύν[θεν]τα vel αἰσχύν[ναν]τα vel αἰσχύν[νον]τα τὰ μῆνδιχα Page (*SLG*)

2]ην : φορβ]ῆν Merk. δέρρ]ην Arnott apud M. 1968 τίν]ην Tarditi σύρ]ην Gall. ἄγχ]ην Treu; [. .]αγχᾶ : [ἀν]άγχαι Merk. [ἀν]άγχα Page [ὀν]άγχαν Luppe

3].ενὶ : αὔ]χενι Merk. τῶμ]φενι Gall.; λᾶ.ολιωι : λαβολίωι Merk.; π.[. .]ᾳν : 'πα[λοί]αν Lloyd-Jones πο[ίν]αν Tarditi 'π' ἄ[γυ]αν Gall. πά[χη]αν Treu; vielleicht eine Form von πιέζω? Austin apud M. 1968.

4]. : καὶ μάν] κ' Merk. ἦ μάν] κ' Kassel καὶ κ' ὤ]ς Page καὶ γάρ] κ' Gall.

5]..η.[.]˙ : αἰ τὸν θεοβλ]άβεντα Page (apud M.; *LGS*; sed in *SLG* solum]. .ηντα imprimitur) αἰ πρῶτα θεοσ]ύλαντα Gall. αἰ φῶτα θεοσ]ύληντα Treu

6]....εον.. σ : ἴσως κε π]αρπλέοντες Page οὕτω κε π]αρπλέοντες Lloyd-Jones οἱ δ' αὖτε π]αρπλέοντες Gall.

7]. : ληοτέρας] κ' Merk. πραϋτέρα]ς Page (apud M.; *LGS*) ἀργαλέα]ς Gall. ῥαϊτέρα]ς Page (*SLG*)

8] : ἴρηα δ'] vel γέραιρα δ'] Merk. καὶ μὰν τότ'] Page apud M. ἀλλ' ἀ μὲν] Page (*LGS*; *SLG*) οὕτω μὲν] Gall.

9].ανᾶᾶς : ἄγαλμ' 'Α]θανάας Merk. ἴκτωρ 'Α]θανάας Page (apud M.; *LGS*) ἄρατ' 'Α]θανάας Gall. ἄγαλμ']⟨'Αθ⟩ανάας Page (*SLG*)

10] : κατῆχ'] Merk. κάτισδ'] Page (apud M.; *LGS*) λύγρως] Gall. ἄμπηχ'] Treu ἀμπῆχ'] Page (*SLG*); απᾶππενᾶ : ἀπαππένα Merk. ἐπαμμένα Lobel ἐπαππένα Page (*LGS*; *SLG*)

11]νὲὲς : δυσμέ]νεες Merk.; πολιν : πόλιν⟨δ'⟩ Lobel apud M. πόλιν ⟨τ'⟩ Page πολη' Lloyd-Jones; ἐπήπὸν : ἐπῆπον Merk. ἔπηπον Page;

12].ᾶς : δόμον Λαχαίν]ας Gall.

13].ν : ἔπεφν]ον Merk. δύσταν]ον Gall. κατέκτ]αν Page (*SLG*); [..].τ[.].χεος : [ἀπ]ὺ τ[ε]ίχεος Lobel, Page apud M.

14]ι : δέδαε κα]ὶ Merk. ὄρωρε κα]ὶ Page ἔλαμψε κα]ὶ Lloyd-Jones ἔνωρτο κα]ὶ Gall.

15]ον : Δαρδάνι]ον Page, Treu apud M.

16].σσὰν (].[.]αν in O 2) : Αἴας δε λ]ύσσαν Merk.

17].[].νᾶς : ἐς ναῦον ἄ]γνας Page, Kassel εἰς ἶρον ἄ]γνας Gall.

18].ι (O 4) : ἄνδρεσ]σι Gall. θνάτοι]σι Page βρότοι]σι Colonna φώτεσ]σι (or ἄνδρεσ]σι) Merk.

19]..τᾶ (].α in O 5) : δεινο]τάτα Gall. ἐχθρο]τάτα Colonna πικρο]τάτα Page 1955 αἰνοτάτα Page (*SLG*)
Nomen μακάρων in C omissum est.

20].ι (O 6) : χείρεσ]σι Merk. χέρρεσ]σι Page ἐν χέρ]σι West

21] (O 7) : ἴρωι] Gallavotti 1953 βία] Colonna σέμνωι] Page ἄλλως] Merk. ἄγναν] Treu (1963) θέας] Kassel, West κήνας] Gall.

22 ολ[.]χρος (O 8) : ὁ Λ[ό]χρος Lobel e.p.;] (O 8) : κάταγ'] Gallavotti 1953 κάτελκ'] Colonna ὔβρισσ'] Page ἔρυσσ'] Merk., Kassel ἔξηλκ'] West ἤισχυν'] or ὔβρισσ'] Lloyd-Jones ὔβρισδ' Gall.

23]. . . (O 9) : παῖδα Δ]ίος Gall. τὰν βάρ]εος West

24 [.]φρυσιν (O 10) : ὄ]φρυσιν Lobel e.p.;]ν· (O 10) : θεαίνα]ν Gallavotti 1953 γοργῶπι]ν Page (1955; apud M.) ἀλλ' ἦλκε]ν Gall. πάρεσσα]ν Führer 1984

25 σμ[: σμ[έρδνον Merk. σμ[έρδνα Tarditi σμ[οίως Lloyd-Jones apud M. 1968 σμ[ῦχεν Treu σμ[ῖκρον Gall.; π[ ]δνωθεισα : π[ε]λ[ι]δνώθεισα Lobel (e.p., cf. the commentary)

26 αφάντοι [(O 12) : ἀφάντοι[ς Lobel e.p.; . . .[(C) +]το[] (O 12) : ἄϊξ[ε πόν]το[ν Merk.

27 εξαπ[: ἐξαπ[ίνας Merk.; Page (apud M.; *SLG*) coniunxit O 11-13 cum C 33-35:

ἀ δὲ δεῖνον ὐπ' ὄφρυσιν
] πελιδνώθεισα κὰτ ὄινοπα
ἔβασκε | [πόν]το[ν], ἐκ δ' ἀφάντοις
παννυχίο|ις ἐκύκα θυέλλαις.

30 α. .[: 'Αχα[ι Merk.

38 πο.[: πόν[τον Merk.

39 ω.σεβι.[: ὤρσε βία[ν Merk.

43 εν.[: ἔνο[ς Merk.

44 δυ. . .δεκαμ : οὐδ' ὦδε καμ[Merk.; αμ[: ἄμ[μιν vel ἀμ[μέων Snell

45 μενω.[: ὤν[ηρ vel ὤν[vel μένων[Merk.

46 ἄτᾱνβροτ.[: ἄ τ' ἀμβρότη[Merk. ἀνβρότα[vel ἀ τὰν βροτ.[Snell

47 ωϋρρᾰδον.[: ὦ Ὕρρα δον.[Snell apud M. 1968 ὦ Ὑρράδιον.[Lloyd-Jones

48 χεληto[: χέλητο[ς Merk.

Commentary

1 The fragment begins with the second hendecasyllabus of an Alcaic stanza (we can not be sure that it was the first stanza of the poem) and in the middle of a sentence. Since the main verb is lacking, it is impossible to say how this first sentence was construed. That the line began with the aorist participle of δράω seems probable, considering that only one syllable is needed and that τὰ μήνδικα is a suitable object.

Lobel's guess (apud M., 85) that the brevity mark above the υ of the second word suggests αἰσχυν[ν seems right. This word must have been a participle as well. Merkelbach's suggestion (αἰσχυννέστατα), adopted by Treu, can hardly be correct. The adjective αἴσχυν(ν)ος did not exist, as far as we know, and even if, in theory, it might have existed, as Merkelbach and Strunk contend, we are left with a quite abnormal superlative form.

Above the first line there is a gloss that reads:

πολεμος
]. υτι

The closing letters, ς and ι, are situated above the ν of]σαντας and separated from the empty space that is to their right by a tiny vertical line. I think, therefore, that this gloss belongs to the column that was once on the left of our text and does not comment on the first lines of this fragment. Much lower and more to the right there is another gloss above the first line: μήνδικα τὰ μὴ ἔ[νδικα τ]ὰ μὴ ἐν δίκῃ κείμενα, an explanation that hardly calls for comment.

2-3 These lines seem to contain a complete sentence but admit nevertheless of no reconstruction.

]ην: probably an infinitive form. Merkelbach's φορβῆν = φορβειάν can not be right. I know of no parallel to such an accusative form in Lesbian dialect. The only form of an accusative sing. ending in -ην is that of adjectives in -εσ-.

περβαλον.: περβάλοντ' seems probable, but the meaning of the verb is not quite sure. Most editors assume that περβάλλω is used in the sense of the Attic περιβάλλω. Lloyd-Jones, for instance, translates: 'we must put a (noose?) about his neck and ...' (127). However, the verb might also have the meaning of the Attic ὑπερβάλλω; in this way Gallavotti seems to take it (cf. below).

]αγκα: represents, according to all editors, a form of ἀνάγκα. Some of them (Merkelbach, Tarditi) take it to be a dative form and add a ι without comment. But can it be taken for granted that the scribe wrote the dative form in this way? It is true that he omitted the ι adscriptum in 8

(ναύω), but in 3 it is unmistakably present (λαβολίωι). Moreover, we must take into account that in literary papyri of the 1st century A.D. the ι is not, as a rule, omitted after a long vowel. It is, therefore, more probable that the scribe of C usually wrote the ι but sometimes forgot it than that he did *not* write it, but sometimes added it accidentally. So ἀνάγκαι is not, in my view, an alternative reading, but an emendation.

].ενι: αὔχενι cannot be right, as Gallavotti (4) observes. Hiatus between ἀνάγκα and the next word is illicit. For that reason Gallavotti adds the article and reads τὤμφενι (with ἄμφενι instead of αὔχενι on account of *Theocr.* 30.28). That seems an easy way out, but, in view of the general practice in Lesbian poetry, one may ask whether an article is called for. I think it is not.

λα.ολιωι: one can think of no other supplement than a β. A word λαβόλιον or λαβόλιος is attested nowhere, but in Alcaeus fr. 68,3 we find λάβολος, probably an adjective, meaning 'deserving to be stoned'. Cf. Hesychius: ληβόλε · λιθοβόλε · ἄξιε λιθασθῆναι (the accentuation, by the way, is strange; one would expect λήβολε and λιθόβολε). Generally it is assumed that λαβόλιον = λιθοβολία = stoning. Gallavotti, however, argues that a substantive on -ιον is not, as a rule, a *nomen actionis* and that the interlinear gloss does not read λευσμω (as Merkelbach supposes) but λευστω. He takes it (5) that λαβόλιος was an adjective with the same meaning as λάβολος.

Gallavotti's arguments are not conclusive. The rule admits of exceptions (e.g. ἁμάρτιον, συμπόσιον, λιποτάξιον) and the gloss is not really legible. In all likelihood nobody would have suggested the letters λευ if λαβολίωι were not in the text, and though I think -στω slightly more probable than -σμω, this cannot be considered sufficient proof that λαβολίωι is an adjective rather than a substantive. Neither possibility can be precluded. Personally, however, I am not inclined to regard the word as an adjective. If it were, it would merely be an invective, while, in view of the parallel with the myth, one would expect a reference to the *act* of stoning. Moreover, Gallavotti connects this invective with the substantive 'neck', but I fail to understand why especially the neck would be furnished with such an epithet. A neck may deserve hanging or a man stoning, but a neck that deserves stoning seems slightly absurd.

π.[..]ᾰ̣ν: the α is only partly legible, but the ˘ above it is as clear as one may wish. Lloyd-Jones' suggestion 'παλοίαν (infinitive of the Homeric ἀπαλοιάω; Δ 522) ignores this indication. Moreover, his reconstruction of the sentence ('we must put a (noose?) about his neck and destroy him by stoning') implies that the first word of v. 2 was the acc. of a substantive, which, as I have indicated above, is impossible.

Now what is the outcome of all this? At first sight it seems natural to

consider ἀνάγκα (ἐστί) as the predicate. In that case the construction might be as follows:

1. the infinitive hidden in]ην depends on ἀνάγκα
2. περβάλοντ' (= περιβαλόντ') is a participle with the (implicit) subject of the inf.
3. the first word of v. 3 seems to be a dative with περβάλοντ', but since αὔχενι cannot stand and the article is out of place, one is at a loss to explain.
4. λαβολίωι, if a substantive, is an instrumental dative with the infinitive; if an adjective, it is connected with the preceding dative.
5. π.[..]ᾶν, whatever it may be, is object with περβάλοντ'.

This rather poor result is further complicated by a gloss, written to the right of ἀνάγκα. It seems to read: τὴν ἀγχόνην οὕτως εἴρηκε δεσμὸν τὴν ἀνάγκην. It is not quite clear in which way these words cohere, but at any rate they suggest that ἀνάγκη is used in the sense of 'fetter' or 'strangling'. If we accept this information and retain the nominative, the construction of the sentence becomes totally opaque. If we emend (with Merkelbach) into ἀνάγκαι, we must assume that a verb meaning 'ought to' occurred in the lost line (or lines) at the beginning and that ἀνάγκαι is an instrumental dative with περβάλοντ'.

Merkelbach (reading ἀνάγκαι) agrees with the scholiast: "ἀνάγκα "Schlinge, Fessel"; Kassel verweist auf Hesiod, Theog. 614 ff.; Pindar, Pyth. 4,234; Aesch. Prom. 108 ff.; Schreckenberg Ananke (Zetemata 36, 1964) 1 ff." (85). I am, however, not convinced that any of these passages offers a real parallel. In each case compulsion is realized by binding or yoking, but that does not prove that ἀνάγκη really *means* 'rope' or 'fetter'. There would be some reason to accept this as a possible meaning, if Schreckenberg were right in deriving the substantive from the Semitic root ḫnk, but this etymology has not met with general approval. Cf. Chantraine (DE s.v.): "Il soutient non sans arbitraire que certains passages homériques évoquent des captifs enchaînés par le cou et propose finalement une étymologie impossible."

Despite the objections raised above one might be inclined to believe the scholiast, supposing that he may have known more than we do. But even then the reading ἀνάγκαι can hardly be right in view of the awkward accumulation of datives. Moreover, it would hardly yield sense. If we do accept the scholiast's explanation, it would be better to follow Luppe in reading ὀνάγκην. Luppe surmises that the copyist mistook an abridged ν in his exemplar for a quantity sign and that the accusative τὴν ἀνάγκην, in the gloss, is meant to explain ὀνάγκην with Lesbian ο instead of α: "In τὴν ἀγχόνην οὕτως εἴρηκε - δεσμόν - τὴν ἀνάγκην wären die letzten beiden Akkusative ursprünglich selbständige Glossen, die im Kasus dem Dichtertext entsprächen." (30). One might object that the form ὀνάγκη

is attested nowhere, while ἀνάγκη is (Alc. fr. 75,6). On the other hand, Luppe's solution has the added advantage (not mentioned by himself) that we can read αὔχενι without qualms about hiatus.

If Luppe is right, the sentence must have run roughly as follows: (one ought) after throwing a ? rope round their (your?) neck to ? them (you?) by stoning. This seems more or less satisfying; the rope round the victim's neck may serve to prevent escape (cf. Lloyd-Jones, 129, n. 7; in that case we must imagine that it was tied to a pole or something) or to lead him to the place of execution. Yet, one problem remains. Luppe takes]ην to represent an adjective and adopts Lloyd-Jones' suggestion 'παλοίαν, neglecting the brevity mark above the final α (cf. *supra*). If we do *not* neglect this mark and assume that]ην represents an infinitive and the final word an adjective, the position of this adjective seems very strange: placed at the end of the sentence (and the stanza) and separated from its noun by two substantives, it would be strongly emphasized without apparent reason. This objection would be less forceful, if we consider λαβολίωι an adjective. However, as I indicated above, I do not think this a satisfying solution.

For the sake of completeness I mention the reconstructions of Tarditi, Treu and Gallavotti. Tarditi (90) proposes:

τίν]ην δὲ περβάλον[τ' ἀν]άγκα⟨ι⟩
αὔ]χ̣ε̣νι λ̣α̣βολίωι ⟨τε⟩ πο̣[ίν]αν

He does not translate these lines and I am sorry to say that I cannot. I assume that the wrongdoers are subject of τίνην ... ποίναν and that ἀνάγκαι and λαβολίωι are instrumental datives; περβάλοντ' and αὔχενι I am unable to fit in.

Treu (58): [ἄγχ]ην δὲ περβάλον[τ' ἀν]άγκα
[αὔ]χενι λαβολίωι πά[χη]αν

He, too, does not translate and again I do not quite understand the Greek. I cannot find a substantive that is qualified by the adjective πάχηαν.

Finally Gallavotti (8): σύρ]ην δὲ περβάλον[τ' ἀν]άγκα
τῶμφ]ε̣νι λ̣α̣βολίωι 'π' ἄ̣[γυ]αν

He translates: sed nimium transgressum opus est in viam traducere retento collo ad lapidandum (10). As I mentioned above, Gallavotti seems to take it that περβάλλω is used in the sense of the Attic ὑπερβάλλω. However, the translation *nimium transgressum* seems doubtful to me, while 'π' ἄγυαν is rather arbitrary. Moreover, the translation does not bring out that λαβολίωι is connected with τῶμφενι, not with the object of σύρην. Finally,—and this is the main objection—σύρειν τινὰ αὐχένι cannot possibly mean 'to drag someone *by* his neck'.

All in all we must conclude that too many pieces of the jigsaw puzzle

are missing for us to attain any degree of certainty. Nevertheless, most scholars agree to the gist of what the poet meant to say, viz.: the wrongdoer(s) ought to be stoned. They also agree that the lines refer to Pittacus or to Pittacus and his political associates. Is this at least a safe assumption?

Rösler (208-218) was the first to combate this general opinion. According to him the obelized lines of C (25-31) belong to the lost beginning of the poem. Consequently, the first line of the extant fragment would be at least v. 10 of the poem. Moreover, Rösler argues that the opening stanzas of the poem contained the story of Aias' trial (as described by Proclus) and did not (explicitly) refer to the political struggle of Alcaeus' own time. He does not deny that it is a political poem, but he thinks that contemporary politics came in only at the end.

Recently, Meyerhoff has adopted Rösler's theory, though with one modification. He argues (as I did in my paper) that Proclus' version of the story would be out of place in Alcaeus' poem: if Aias escaped to the altar of Athena, the Greeks could only punish him by repeating his crime and becoming 'robbers of the god' in their turn. Meyerhoff thinks, therefore, that Alcaeus used a different version of the story (possibly adopted from the *Little Iliad*) and that, in the poem, Aias escaped punishment in another way, perhaps by swearing a false oath. If Meyerhoff is right, we must assume that Aias swore he was not guilty, but if so, it is hard to see why the other Greeks were to blame, since they were deceived by his perjury.

In his review on Meyerhoff's book Rösler defends his former opinion with a new argument. He points to Libanius (*Refutationes* VIII,129): λόγον δὲ οὐδένα τοῦ τετολμημένου ποιεῖσθαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας, πρὶν Κάλχας εἶπεν ὡς ὠργίζετο ἡ θεός, τότε δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν δίκην ἐλθεῖν μέν, λαβεῖν δὲ οὐ δυνηθῆναι προκαταφυγόντος τοῦ τὰ δεινὰ εἰργασμένου πρὸς βωμούς τινας θεῶν. Rösler assumes that this was the story as found in the *Iliou Persis* and Alcaeus' poem. The Greeks ought to have killed Aias immediately, but they waited till Calchas' exhortation and gave Aias time to escape, not, according to Rösler, 'to some altars of the gods', but to the altar of Athena. By taking refuge at the altar of the very goddess that he had terribly insulted, Aias committed a second sin, and so did the Greeks who did not stop him. I grant that this is plausible, but it removes only one of my objections and I am still far from convinced by the theory as a whole.

As I have said in my Introduction, fr. 306 A does not prove that the trial of Aias formed part of the poem, though we a priori cannot preclude the possibility. But it seems highly improbable to me that the poem *opened* with the trial. First, one cannot describe a trial without naming the crime. That implies that Aias' terrible deed was described twice, first in

outline, subsequently in detail. I think such a procedure would impair the economy of the poem and the impact of the sixth stanza. Second, if we assume that the first stanza (if it was the first: I agree with Rösler that we cannot be sure) *did* refer to the political reality of Alcaeus' own time, it is easy to see why the poet introduces his mythical example with its conclusion or moral: by doing so he immediately makes clear the connection between reality and myth. The function of the second stanza is, in this case, both introductory and transitional, though the transition to the third one seems, even now, rather abrupt. On the other hand, if the middle part of the story (the trial) has been told already, the second stanza rounds off the foregoing narrative (cf. Rösler, 216-17, who states this emphatically). The function of the stanza is now conclusive and this makes the transition to the third stanza, containing the very beginning of the story, almost unbearably harsh. Third, if the trial was described extensively at the opening of the poem, why then is it completely ignored in the sequel? When Aias has committed his crime, the goddess reacts at once, without awaiting the reaction of the Greeks. According to Meyerhoff (152) this was a poetical necessity: since Aias' misdemeanour was the *'causa maior'* of the storm, it had to be immediately connected with this disaster. Consequently, the *'causa minor'* (the abortive trial) had to be placed at the beginning of the poem. Now I agree that perhaps it would not be altogether convincing if, at the crucial moment of his story, the poet told us: 'the goddess, though furious, first waited till the trial was over, and then ...'. But I think that Meyerhoff's poetical necessity is far better realized if the trial was not in the poem at all. The *'causa minor'* is sufficiently implied in the second stanza and the guilt of the Greeks is far more obvious if they did not even try to punish Aias.

There is one more point. Rösler (217) argues that the words and remnants of words of the first stanza support his theory. I rather think that the opposite is true. I fail to see why, for instance, ἀνάγκα would fit in better with a description of the trial than with a reference to contemporary politics, and Rösler does not explain. He only points out that λαβολίωι may refer to the stoning Aias was threatened with. But if his theory is right, the first stanza must have *concluded* the description of the trial and we would, therefore, expect it to refer to Aias' escape (or, according to Meyerhoff, his acquittal). However, I cannot find the slightest indication that this was the case.

Finally, I do not believe that the postponement of Aias' name is a conclusive argument (cf. my Epilogue). And since Rösler's paleographical argument is equally unconvincing (cf. ad 24-8), I stick to the hypothesis that there is a switch from reality to myth in v. 4 and that the poet advocates the stoning of one or more political adversaries. Pittacus' name

is not mentioned in these lines, but we may gather from v. 47 (cf. below) that he was, as in other poems, Alcaeus' target. So he was probably one of the intended victims or possibly the only one. The plural δράσαντας need not stand in the way of such an explanation. It is quite possible that at the beginning of the poem Alcaeus makes a general statement on the punishment deserved by a certain class of criminals. No doubt his audience would understand that there was one criminal who pre-eminently deserved that terrible punishment of stoning.

Stoning was a way of execution that enabled all members of a community to partake in the punishment of a crime that endangered that community as a whole (cf. Hirzel). Such had been the crime of Aias and as such Alcaeus undoubtedly wanted to represent the crime that was committed now. Stoning seldom occurred in Greece. It may be significant that, according to Herodotus (5.38), while most of the other cities merely expelled their deposed rulers, the Mytileneans stoned their tyrant Coas to death (499 BC). Herodotus' wording (ἐξαγαγόντες κατέλευσαν) even suggests that there was a fixed place for such executions. Perhaps Coas had aroused far greater hatred than the other tyrants, but still the passage in Herodotus might be an indication that the citizens of Mytilene considered stoning a suitable punishment for usurpers of power.

4-5 Despite uncertainties the gist of these lines seems clear: the Greeks would have been better off, if they had punished the culprit.

It seems reasonably sure that the object of κατέκτανον is meant to be Aias. Since Aias was *not* killed by the Greeks, κατέκτανον must be a contrary-to-fact statement and so must ἦς. Consequently, κε in v. 4 and αἰ in v. 5 are indispensable.

Assuming that the mythical example is introduced in v. 4, I think Gallavotti's supplement καὶ γάρ κ' the most attractive reading at the beginning of this line. Cf. Sappho 16,6 (γὰρ) and Alcaeus 38,5 (καὶ γὰρ), referred to by Lloyd-Jones (128).

The scholion (θεοσύλη ὄντα) seems to support θεοσύληντα, the reading of Treu. The synizesis is repeated in v. 18 (θεοσύλαισι). The η may be defensible in spite of Osthoff's law; cf. Slings 263-6. The verb θεοσυλέω/θεοσύλημι is attested nowhere, but there is no reason why Alcaeus would not use it if he used the adjective θεοσύλης. We may take it in its literal sense ('rob a god'), since Aias does indeed rob the goddess of her ward.

6-7 The reading παρπλέοντες (6) is generally accepted and seems probable indeed, though only a few letters are really legible.

Most editors take it that ἔτυχον (like ἦς and κατέκτανον) is a contrary-to-fact statement and therefore supply κε in v. 6 or 7 and a comparative form, meaning 'more gentle' or the like, at the beginning of v. 7 (cf.

app.crit.). In that case the rough meaning of these lines would be: when sailing past Aegae they would have found the sea more gentle. Gallavotti is the only one to think that the lines refer to what really happened. Consequently, he omits κε and supplies an adjective with an ominous meaning (ἀργαλέας). Both interpretations seem, in theory, possible.

Αἴγαις: Huxley rightly argues that Merkelbach and Lloyd-Jones too readily take for granted that with Aegae a town on Euboea is meant. Merkelbach (87) simply asserts: 'Aegae, die Stadt auf Euboea', without indicating where that town was located , while Lloyd-Jones (138) tacitly assumes that Merkelbach, like himself, identifies it with Carystus. However, the arguments for this identification are somewhat meagre. Lloyd-Jones, assuming that the names Aegae and Aegaia were used indiscriminately, refers to Stephanus of Byzantium, who remarks on Carystus: ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ Αἰγαία. Stephanus may be right, but we cannot possibly know whether his information holds good for the time of Alcaeus. And surely Lloyd-Jones' reference to the Towneleian Scholia on the *Iliad* (N 21) and to Strabo (VIII, 7, 4; IX, 2,13) is merely misleading. It is true that both the scholiast and Strabo locate Aegae on Euboea, but neither of them identifies it with Carystus. Strabo (IX, 2, 13) exactly explains where Aegae was situated: it was a sanctuary of Poseidon on the western coast of Euboea, built at a site where there was once (when?) also a town. I may add that, according to Bakhuizen (125-6), Strabo was mistaken; he suspects that there never was a town called Aegae on Euboea, but that Aegae was the former name of Mt. Kandhíli. Moreover, even if Strabo was right, the site he indicates is some 80 miles away from Carystus and an improbable candidate for the shipwreck. The Locrian Aias himself might sail between Euboea and the mainland, but why would the other Greeks?

Huxley draws attention to Sappho fr. 17. This fragment, though very mutilated, seems to relate an involuntary delay of the Atreidae on Lesbos; they could not depart before they had secured the help of the trias Hera-Zeus-Dionysus. According to Page (1955; cf. Meyerhoff 223-4) this must have been a local Lesbian tradition. Huxley assumes that, in Sappho's poem, the Achaean fleet was driven to Lesbos by a storm and that this was the case in Alcaeus' poem as well. If so, the poet may refer to Αἰγά, the spur of Mt. Canê (Steph. Byz., 38 Meineke; Strabo XIII,1,68). The plural need not be an objection; Huxley compares the North Peloponnesian town that, likewise, was alternatively called Aegae and Aega (Strabo, VIII,7,5).

Here again we cannot perhaps be really sure about the geographical name in Alcaeus' time, but apart from that I find Huxley's theory attractive. I am left with only one difficulty. Alcaeus' text suggests that the

storm fell upon the Greeks when they were sailing past Aegae. Huxley, however, assumes that the storm broke out much earlier and that the same storm had driven them into the gulf of Adramytteion. Still I think that his suggestion does not deserve to be ignored, as it is for example by Kramer-Hagendorn, who simply repeat Merkelbach's comment. One might, of course, ask whether it really matters where Aegae was situated. In a certain way it does. Huxley rightly remarks that, if Aegae was situated near Lesbos, the revenge of the goddess is more immediate and that there is an extra, geographical, connection between myth and reality.

8-10 Gallavotti's suggestions (οὕτω μὲν in 8; ἄρατ' in 9) have to be rejected. If Kassandra, before being assaulted by Aias, is praying for a rough sea to afflict the whole army, the shipwreck is provided with a double justification: the Greeks atone both for their own deeds and for the guilt of Aias. Thus what seems to be the basic conception of the poem (the punishment of one man may be necessary to prevent the entire community from suffering) is completely undermined.

If we accept that ἔτυχον in v. 7 was modified by the particle κε, a clear-cut contrast at the beginning of 8 is, I think, necessary. Page suggests ἀλλ' ἀ μὲν; one might also think of ἀλλ' ἀ γὰρ: but (they did not find the sea more tractable) for ...

The reading 'Α]θ̣ανάας is generally accepted, but the data offered by the papyrus are rather puzzling. As I mentioned in the Introduction, there is an unmistakable brevity mark above the last α of].αναας. To the left of the first α there is the beginning of a vertical stroke; beneath this stroke but not quite conjoined with it is a horizontal line that runs beyond the left leg of the A. 'Certe non Θ' is Page's verdict (*SLG*), but Merkelbach and Koenen (184, n.2) do think it possible that the remnants indicate this letter. Koenen supposes the horizontal line to be a hyphen. That, however, cannot be the case. C has a hyphen four times (under μῆνδικα, πολυλάιδος, θεοσύλητα (?) and θεοσύλαισι). Its stroke is curved while this one is not, and it is situated further beneath the line. Moreover, what would be the sense of a hyphen here? The copyist seems to have placed it merely beneath words that consist of two components.

Page (*SLG*) prints ἄγαλμ' | ⟨'Αθ⟩ανάας, supposing that the copyist forgot two letters. I agree with him that the θ is dubious. It may be true that the θ of this scribe tends to be somewhat angular (e.g. in v. 16), but its outer line is always closed and in v. 7 (where, like here, it is followed by an α) there is no trace of a horizontal line. On the other hand, according to both Parsons and Worp, we cannot really preclude the possibility of a θ and Koenen is right that the mere word ἄγαλμ' is too short to fill the available room. Happily there is one thing all scholars agree on: since

no other reading is possible, we must assume that Alcaeus wrote Ἀθανάας.

10 The first α of ἀπαππένα (10) is no longer visible on the papyrus, but on an earlier photograph there is an unmistakable trace. Much ink has been spilled on this remarkable participle. Merkelbach (87) quotes Page's judgment: 'it seems incredible that any Greek dialect turned -απμενος to -αππενος'. Nevertheless, Page (*LGS*, *SLG*) prints the double ππ, though he changes to ἐπαππένα, in view of the meaning required. Probably, however, the participle stands neither for ἐφημμένη nor for ἀφημμένη, but simply for ἡμμένη. Slings has argued convincingly that we have here an instance of Attic reduplication.

If we suppose that ἄγαλμ' was the first word of v. 9 (which is far from sure), it must have been object to a verb in v. 10. However, neither κατῆχ' (Merkelbach), nor ἄμπηχ' (Treu; for the accentuation cf. below ad 11-13), are quite satisfactory. κατέχειν in the sense 'hold fast' is rather unusual, while ἀμπέχειν does not completely suit the context. Since Kassandra clasps the chin of the goddess, she does not really embrace the statue. Page, when editing *SLG*, apparently rejected his former suggestion ἴκτωρ in 9 and κάτισδ' in 10 (*LGS*). Rightly of course, since Kassandra is clearly standing (v. 21). Moreover, if one tries to visualize this scene in the temple, one can hardly imagine a statue of so small a size that a woman can touch its face while sitting down. Perhaps it is better to refrain from guesses when both object and verb are completely lacking.

γενείω: some editors (Page, Lloyd-Jones) print γενήω, the correct Lesbian form. I think it better not to meddle with the form: it may be simply an error of some scribe, but perhaps, as Radt points out, it is an epicism.

11 In view of its position in the Alcaic decasyllabus the second syllable of πόλιν must be long. Strunk defends the possibility of a long ι on linguistic grounds. He surmises that in certain dialects the ι was originally long or that the acc. pl. πόλῑς may have facilitated the creation of πόλῑν. One may also think of metrical lengthening, as we sometimes find in the poetry of Pindar and Bacchylides (e.g. πόλῑν Ἀχαίοις, B. 11,14). There are, however, as Strunk is the first to admit, no parallels in Lesbian poetry.

Merkelbach and, apparently, Voigt have been convinced by Strunk's linguistic arguments. Gentili (744-5), Führer (27) and Radt accept the possibility of metrical lengthening. Führer thinks that Alcaeus found the example of such metrical licence in older Lesbian poetry, now unknown to us. According to Radt Alcaeus followed Homeric examples (A 19; B 329; Π 57; δ 249). Other scholars (Page, Lloyd-Jones, Tarditi, Gallavotti) print a crux or alter the text.

I think we ought to accept the transmitted text and the metrical lengthening. It is, for sure, a difficult methodic problem. Ought we to reject this solution, since such a lengthening does not occur elsewhere in Lesbian poetry, or had we better say: here it is, so it apparently occurred? I am inclined to choose the second approach, the more so since much of Lesbian poetry is lost and since there is no obvious way to restore the text.

Lloyd-Jones' πολή' eliminates one anomaly by another. πόλινδ' (Lobel apud M., Gallavotti) is excluded by the meaning of ἐφέπω, which cannot mean 'march *upon*' or the like. If we adopt Page's suggestion πόλιν τε and his supplement κατέκταν at the beginning of v. 13, we must assume that πόλιν τ' ἔπηπον corresponds with Δαΐφοβόν τ' ἄμα κατέκταν. However, τ' ἄμα rather suggests a second object with κατέκταν.

The meaning of ἐφέπω in πόλιν ἔπηπον is discussed nowhere. We only find translations without comment: "the enemies were besetting the city" (Lloyd-Jones, 128), "die Feinde besetzten die Stadt" (Rösler, 210), "while foemen stormed the town" (Burnett, 199). However, a thoughtless translation of the verb may influence the interpretation, as appears from Burnett's remark on the subject: "In the pause that follows (between stanzas three and four) Troy falls, and at line twelve the men who were without are discovered within the walls, ..." (201). She does not explain this statement, but probably she was led by her own translation. Wrongly, I think, for ἔπηπον can not mean 'they stormed'. Moreover, this meaning would be contrary to the epic tradition: the Greeks did not storm the city, since their commanders, after descending from the wooden horse, opened the gates to the army. It is, therefore, only natural to assume that Kassandra, in the third stanza, seeks protection with the goddess because the Greeks are in the city already.

The basic meaning of ἐφέπω seems to be 'be occupied with', 'handle' or 'manage'. Apart from πότμον ἐπισπεῖν and similar phrases (almost the only instance of the aorist form) three kinds of objects occur: 1. nouns denoting men or horses (in Homer only); 2. abstract nouns mostly denoting a kind of action; 3. nouns denoting a place or space. I have searched intensively for parallels in the third category and I think we only find them in Homer, viz. in ι 121: (κυνηγέται) κορυφὰς ὀρέων ἐφέποντες and Λ 496: ὣς ἔφεπε κλονέων πεδίον τότε φαίδιμος Αἴας. If I am right, πόλιν ἔπηπον must mean: 'they traversed' or 'they stormed through the city' (or rather perhaps: the citadel). For a more elaborate discussion of the meaning of ἐφέπω, see van Erp Taalman Kip, 6f.

I have printed ἔπηπον and, in v. 15, κάτηχε. The accentuation of the papyrus is inconsistent here: ἐπῆπὸν but κὰτηχε. Some editors reproduce this inconsistency (ἐπῆπον, κατῆχε), others print ἔπηπον and κάτηχε or

ἐπῆπον and κατῆχε. I think it best to ignore the contraction (as is usual in the case of the gen. plur. in -αν) and to retract the accent. Perhaps, as Slings suggests, the scribe was inclined to normalize the accentuation of κατηχε, since κατέχω was a verb still regularly used, while ἐφέπω was not.

12-13 Apart from Gallavotti (who offers a rather fanciful reconstruction), editors have refrained from filling the gap in v. 12. Before -ᾱς a small circlet is visible, but due to its position (on a level with the horizontal stroke of the A) and its size it is doubtful whether it can represent a ρ. To its left there is a damaged spot, preceded by some traces that might point to an υ and a π, but one cannot be really sure.

If, indeed, the first word of v. 13 was a verb form meaning 'killed', we expect a second object with this verb in the first half of v. 12. Lloyd-Jones (131-2) proposes a patronymic or παῖδας preceded by a genitive on -οιο. These suggestions cannot be right, since they do not leave room for a connecting particle, since the acc. pl. of a patronymic would end in -αις (not -ας) and since παῖδας has a short α, while, according to the papyrus, the α must be long. I must confess that I prefer not to speculate, when the data are so extremely scarce.

Alcaeus apparently took for granted that his listeners would understand why, among all the victims of that night, only the name of Deïphobus is mentioned. Deïphobus married Helen after Paris' death. He was, therefore, the first and foremost aim of the Greek revenge. (Cf. θ 516-520)

14 It is clear that the first word must have been a verb, but neither δέδαε (Merkelbach) nor ὄρωρε (Page) will do. Lloyd-Jones (132) rightly remarks that we need a past tense here, not a perfect. Gallavotti's aorist form ἔνωρτο is better, though ἐν- is not quite satisfactory.

16 Lobel (c.p.) read the first letter as an υ and printed ụ both in his transcript and in his text. Nevertheless he did not suggest the word λύσσαν since the scribe of O left room for only one letter between ụ and α. He must have omitted a σ. Moreover, he wrote a λ that looks rather like an α, with the result that Lobel, reading ηα and οα, could not guess ἦλθ' and ὀλόαν either. Up to the publication of C the line remained incomprehensible.

16-19 As appears from the apparatus criticus, there is a rather great consensus on these lines. Since vv. 11-15 tell about the general situation in the city and Aias has not yet been mentioned, it is probable that his name is introduced here. As to the other supplements there is no unanimity, but they all yield the same general meaning.

20-23 The supplements in these lines are far from sure, but at any rate we still have a general impression of what happens.

In view of ἄμφοιν it is almost certain that a plural dative of χείρ was at the beginning of v. 20. However, χείρεσσι would be strange in Lesbian dialect. χέρρεσσι is more plausible (cf. Sapph. 90 a, II, 21; Alc. 302 b 4), but the best attested form is χέρσι (Sapph. 81,5; 96,29; Alc. 45,6). West, therefore, suggests ἐν χέρσι, but I think that in this line a simple dative is preferable. Moreover, the position of δ' would be somewhat strange.

As to the verb (23) I would choose a verb form meaning 'dragged'. That is what, according to Proclus, Aias did in the *Iliou Persis* (πρὸς βίαν ἀποσπῶν). In this way it was painted and written on the chest of Cypselos (Paus. V, 19,5: Αἴας Κασσάνδραν ἀπ' Ἀθαναίας Λοκρὸς ἕλκει), and Euripides, too, uses the verb ἕλκειν (*Tro.* 70). That Aias raped his victim on the spot is clearly a much later version (cf. Meyerhoff, 147, and Barner, 193, n.2) which we find in Lycophron, Libanius, Quintus Smyrnaeus and the Homeric scholion I mentioned in my Introduction. Robert (1267) concludes from the scholion that the rape was also found in Callimachus' *Aetia*, but I agree with Pfeiffer (I, 41) that there is no reason to suppose that every detail of the scholiast's story derives from Callimachus. Moreover, even Callimachus' version of the story is late in relation to Alcaeus.

In 23 Lobel prints]. . . in his transcript, but].ọς in his text. Page and West reckoned with these letters when suggesting their supplements (cf. app. crit.).

All editors print δότερραν, though Lobel (rightly in my opinion) thinks that the space between τ and α points rather to δότειραν. The correct Lesbian form is, of course, δότερραν, but cf. γενείω in v. 10.

24 The general reading in v. 24 is:]ν·ἀ δὲ δεῖνον ὐπ' ὄφρυσιν. The letters ν·α are preserved on fr. I b of O, a tiny scrap that merely contains:

]ν·ᾱ[
]·[
]··[

According to Lobel (e.p., 85) the letter in the second line might be a π, the two letters in the third line a τ and an ο. In this way fr. b might fit in with the main text of O. Lobel, however, adds: 'But I can verify neither the location nor the readings.'

When editing *PLF* Lobel and Page did not incorporate fr. b in the text; Page (*LGS*) leaves it out, but in *SLG* he includes it without any comment and so do all other editors. I have hesitated a long time before including fr. b in the main text. Parsons assures me that he cannot ascertain whether Lobel's suggestion is right. But one must concede that π and το fit in very well: after οἴνοπα the substantive πόντον is almost inevitable and the participle πελιδνώθεισα seems—even without the π—rather sure (cf. below). It is only the incorporation of ν· α that has real consequences:

it fixes the beginning of the new sentence and implies a rather unusual, though not impossible, strophic enjambement. Führer (1984) points to the fact that, on the papyrus, there is no full stop after v. 23, while there is one after v. 3,7,15 and 19. This, he argues, is an indication that there *was* an enjambement and that fr. b does, indeed, belong to the main text. One might object that there is no full stop after v. 11 either, but after ἔπηπον we do not really need it, since there is no change of subject in the next (part of the) sentence. I only doubt whether we can be absolutely sure about v. 23: the papyrus is damaged to the right of the ν but there is a trace of ink. Still, weighing everything, I think it probable, though not proved, that fr. b formed part of this stanza.

There is, of course, no certainty whatsoever about the first word of 24. Führer (1984) suggests πάρεσσαν = παροῦσαν, supposing that 32 represents a second writing of 24 (cf. Page apud M. 91). This is merely one of the many proposals to explain the obeli before vv. 25-31 (see below), but even if it were true to fact, I do not think that 32 can really support the reading πάρεσσαν. Führer refers to Merkelbach, who prints . . μ̣ο̣[and comments: "Von den ersten zwei Bst. sind nur Punkte übrig, statt μ kann vielleicht auch αρ gelesen werden. Vor der Lücke ein runder Bst., ε oder σ oder ο." (92) However, I think αρ is improbable; cf. the way these letters are written in παρθενίκαν (20). Moreover, Merkelbach assumes that *two* letters are missing before μ or αρ, not one as in Führer's πάρεσσαν. I am afraid that every suggestion must remain purely speculative.

There is a scholion, spread over 4 lines, in the open space beneath C 24. It reads:]μ̣ελοντοδεενεχε.[
].ιτηνπολινχα.[
].ουα . ο̣ρ̣^{ο}επιλεγ̣ο̣μ̣ε̣.[
].χαρινανδροσο.[

The topmost line is approximately on the same height as v. 49. I doubt whether it extended beyond ενεχε . . But the third line is ostensibly longer and continues beneath the text of the right column, and so did probably the second line and the fourth.

The μ of μελοντο is situated beneath the υ of ὄφρυσι. Since it is quite uncertain how far the lines extended to the left, there is little sense in trying to reconstruct this scholion.

After v. 24 the scribe of C began a new column of 25 lines, only the first letters of which are left. From here on the problems are almost insoluble. To the left of vv. 25-31 are 7 obeli, clearly visible horizontal strokes. There is no agreement on the meaning of these obeli; scholars have approached the problem in several ways.

1. Part of the commentators (Gallavotti, Treu, Tarditi) prefer to ig-

nore the obeli and try their hand at connecting O 11-13 with C 25-27. Merkelbach (92) supposes that there was another obelus before v. 24 and that perhaps 32-39 are an alternative version of 24-31. In that case, too, it should be possible to connect O 11-13 with C 25-27.

2. Page (apud M. 92) assumes that the obeli indicate misplacement and he supposes that either v. 24 or v. 32 had an obelus too. In the former case 32 would represent a second writing of 24 (cf. *supra* ad 24); in the latter one 32 has to be simply eliminated. It does not really matter that, afterwards, Page decided in favour of the second possibility (*SLG*), since the result is the same: he connects O 11-13 with C 33-35 (cf. app.crit.).

3. Fowler argues that obeli were not used to indicate misplacement. He supposes that the scribe of O omitted a number of lines after v. 10 (= C 24) or that these lines were not in his exemplar. Furthermore, he assumes that the scribe of C (or of his exemplar) must have known two versions of the poem: one version that contained the obelized lines and one version that (like O) did not. In that case the obeli would indicate that the lines were lacking in one of the scribe's exemplars and the words δεῖνον ὐπ' ὄφρυσι would be separated from πελιδνώθεισα χατ' οἴνοπα by 8 lines. Fowler prints the text as follows:

]ν·ἀ δὲ δεῖνον ὐπ' [ὄ]φρυσιν
—σμ[
—..[]·[
—εξαπ[
—
—αιδη·[
—ιραις·[
—Αἴας 'Αχα̣[ι-
—ἄνδρος[
—
[—]..μ̣ο̣[
..ρ·[]π[ε]λ[ι]δνώθεισα χὰτ οἴνοπα
ἔβασχε [πόν]το[ν] ἐχ δ' ἀφάντοι[ς
παννυχίο̣ις ἐχύχα θυέλλαις.

According to Fowler, the lines that are missing in O contained the story of Aias' trial.

4. Rösler (cf. supra ad 2-3) thinks that the obelized lines belonged to the lost beginning of the poem and, like Page, connects O 11-13 with C 33-35.

Ad 1. One can hardly imagine that the obeli would have no sense whatsoever and, as to Merkelbach's suggestion, one would like to know a parallel to such an alternative version. What is more important: I think

the connection between O 11-13 and C 25-27 impossible, for several reasons.

As I have indicated above, πόντον seems warranted by οἴνοπα, while κὰτ suggests a verb of motion. For that reason Merkelbach, Treu and others print ἄιξε πόντον, though I doubt whether the traces in C support that reading. However, if Merkelbach is right in deeming ἄιξε possible, the next problem is how to make a suitable word out of the letters σμ-. No supplement that has been proposed is really convincing. To Treu's suggestion σμῦχεν there are several objections. The omission of the syllabic augment would be remarkable (though not impossible) and it is doubtful whether the verb can have the meaning required here. Moreover, the insertion of σμῦχεν results in an asyndeton that hardly can be accepted (see van Erp Taalman Kip, 10-11).

If the problem could be solved by eliminating fr. b, I think we ought to do so, but this does not really help. Without ν·α it would be possible to explain δε as the second half of εἶδε and to insert σμέρδνον in 25 (since in that case εἶδε would be qualified by δεῖνον and πελιδνώθεισα by σμέρδνον; cf. Page (*LGS*)). But then we have another asyndeton, since δ' ἄιξε is out of the question.

If, on the other hand, we suppose that ἄιξε was the only verb in the sentence, σμέρδνον (Merkelbach) or σμοίως (Lloyd-Jones) can hardly stand with δεῖνον. One does not see why the poet would have furnished πελιδνώθεισα with two adverbs meaning roughly the same. σμέρδνᾱ (Tarditi), though formally an adjective, does not improve matters very much. σμῖκρον (Gallavotti) seems meaningless in the context and even slightly ridiculous. It is not enough to find a word that fits, it must also make sense.

A further problem is raised by the letters εξαπ[. In the context, furnished by O, ἐξαπίνας seems the only possible supplement, but I do not think this will do. Führer (1977, 28) remarks that the imperfect ἐχύχα does not fit in with ἐξαπίνας, and he is quite right. I have searched for parallels in the work of numerous writers and have found only two (Th. II,49,2; *Batrachom.* 82; Theoc. 14,32 is dubious). Both in Thucydides and the *Batrachomyomachia* the imperfect may be accounted for (see van Erp Taalman Kip, 12), but I do not find any explanation here. I fail to understand Burnett's blunt assertion (202) that ἐχύχα is an aorist form.

Finally, some words on ὔπ' ὄφρυσι(ν) ... πελιδνώθεισα. The λ of πελιδνώθεισα is no longer visible on the papyrus, as Parsons assures me. But even if we had only -δνώθεισα (without the π of fr. b), there would be no other possibility. The only other verbs ending in -δνόω or -δνόομαι are ἑδνόω (betroth), ψεδνόομαι (become bald) and ἰδνόομαι (bend oneself). Clearly, neither of these will do. But if we assume that the reading is cor-

rect, what does ὑπ' ὄφρυσι(ν) ... πελιδνώθεισα mean? To illustrate these words, all commentators refer to Callimachus fr. 374 (Pf.): ἡ δὲ πελιδνωθεῖσα καὶ ὄμμασι λοξὸν ὑποδράξ/ὀσσομένη. I do not think this parallel really useful, since Callimachus describes *two* symptoms of rage: the face of (probably) a goddess changes colour and she looks angry. However, if there is no second verb in this sentence of Alcaeus' poem, there is only one symptom here. What is said to happen ὑπ' ὄφρυσι must needs refer to the eyes (e.g. *Il.* N 88, O 607-8; Hes. *Th.* 827, 911) and accordingly ὑπ' ὄφρυσι(ν) ... πελιδνώθεισα can only mean that the white of the goddess's eyes became livid, a change of colour described by Hippocrates (Κωακαὶ Προγνώσιες, 214). One can imagine that, to a physician, such a change may be important as a diagnostic indication, but as a symptom of divine rage it does not seem quite convincing.

It is small wonder that the translations of the phrase are equally unconvincing. Burnett's "with a dread bright glare" is impressive, but does not render the Greek. Barner translates: "furchtbar erblassend unter den Brauen" (197). Now eyes cannot grow pale, while a face can. But why 'under the eyebrows', if the face is meant? Moreover, πελιδνόομαι does not mean 'grow pale' but 'become livid' (van Erp Taalman Kip, 9-10). I think ὑπ' ὄφρυσι(ν) requires a verb other than πελιδνώθεισα. Page apparently thought the same, when he introduced εἶδε in v. 24 (LGS) or εἶδεν in v. 26 (1955). Cf. Lloyd-Jones (134): "The context seems to demand that the word following ὄφρυσι should be a verb ...". Unfortunately, this verb does not present itself, nor is the problem solved if we connect O 11-13 with C 33-35.

Ad 2. If v. 38 began with ἄιξε πόντον (which it seemingly did), it would be somewhat surprising that these words followed ἔβασκε πόντον at so short a distance. This is, of course, no decisive objection, but it does make one doubt. Moreover, Koenen points out that Page's reconstruction does not seem to reckon with the space available in O. 'If the combination were correct, in these two lines of the *POxy* (12-13), 9 letters would have been broken off though only 6 letters are missing in the preceding lines (2-9).' (184) I think Koenen is right, though I do not agree when he returns to Merkelbach's theory of an alternative version.

Ad 3. Fowler has been the first to thoroughly discuss the possible meanings of the obeli. His solution is ingenious and has the added advantage (not mentioned by himself) that it disconnects ὑπ' ὄφρυσι from πελιδνώθεισα. Burnett (205, note 66) objects that Fowler's supposition 'leaves the frowning goddess of l. 24 rather up in the air', and the narrative would, indeed, seem more impressive when Athena's preparations for revenge are immediately connected with Aias' sin (cf. the commentary ad 3-4). This is not, of course, a decisive argument, but the fact re-

mains that Fowler's theory is rather speculative and that it is open to the same objection as that of Page. I dare not accept it unreservedly.

Ad 4. I already explained why I do not believe that the poem began with the trial of Aias. I also doubt whether a scribal error as supposed by Rösler is really probable. It is true that the switch to a new column may cause mistakes. But can it really explain that the eyes of the scribe wandered back in his exemplar over a distance of 34 lines? I hardly think so, unless he was half asleep. Finally, here again Koenen's objection is valid.

It may have become clear that none of the above explanations completely convinces me. I have, therefore, finally decided to attempt no connection whatsoever between O and the second column of C and confined myself to printing both texts separately. On the text of O still a few more remarks.

I have long been in doubt how to print O 12. In Lobel's first edition we find: ἐκ δ' ἀφάντοις (without dots), but Parsons confirmed my suspicion that the letters εκ are no longer legible. On the other hand, I am nearly convinced that Lobel read them, the more so since wishful thinking is out of the question. Lobel was far from happy with this reading: "I must ... confess to some bewilderment at ἐκ. ἐκκυκᾶν is neither recorded nor to be expected." (87) I have, therefore, decided to print ἐκ, but I have added the dots.

As far as I know ἐκκυκάω is still unattested. The meaning of κυκάω is generally: 'stir, throw into a turmoil', but this meaning will not do here, since, as Lobel (e.p. 87) rightly remarks, in that case we would expect the sea to be the object. In this verse it rather means 'brew, concoct', as in Sapph. fr. 137,4; Men. *Epitr.* 428, 573; Ar. *Lys.* 491. (ἐκ ...) ἐκύκα we might translate: she was conjuring up (cf. van Erp Taalman Kip 12-13).

According to Page (1955) ἀφάντοις has to mean 'dark', though there is only one parallel for this meaning (Parm. 9,3: φάεος καὶ νυκτὸς ἀφάντου). Barner supposes that we ought to read ἀφάντω. Lloyd-Jones renders: 'invisible, lurking', which would be the normal meaning of the word. I think this possible. While the goddess was conjuring up the storms, they were as yet invisible and nobody could expect that they would break.

Little can be said about the remnants in the right column of C. Some words can be recognized, but one cannot even begin to form a sentence. It is clear, though, that the description of the storm is continued till at least v. 39 and that in v. 45, with the present tense ζώει, the story of Aias is over. V. 47 must, in one way or another, refer to Pittacus. Hyrras seems to have been the name of Pittacus' father and Ὕρραον (Alc. fr.

129,13) is generally explained as an adjective derived from this name. However, Diogenes Laertius introduces the Mytilenean statesman as Πιτταχὸς 'Υρραδίου (I, 74) and he quotes an epigram of Callimachus in which Pittacus is called παῖδα τὸν 'Υρραδίου (D.L. I, 80 = *Epigr.* 1 Pf.). Most scholars assume that Callimachus did not write 'Υρραδίου but 'Υρράδιον, since Dionysius Thrax (*Gr. Gr.* I 26 Uhlig) quotes 'Υρράδιος as an Aeolic form of the patronymic (cf. Eust. XIII, 45-46). If Dionysius is right, Diogenes mistook the patronymic for a proper name, an error that occurs again in the *Suda* (π 1659). Yet, elsewhere this same lexicon gives Hyrras as the name of Pittacus' father (υ 663).

Though the above data confirm that a word beginning with 'Υρρα- refers to Pittacus' father, there apparently was some confusion about the name and the strange form "Υρραδον only adds to this confusion. Snell (apud M.) has suggested to split the word and to read "Υρρα δον.[, supposing that Alcaeus wrote something like: o Hyrras, would that you had not bred such a son. I do not think this probable. We can hardly imagine that the beginning of the next stanza (κελητο̣[probably represents the genitive of κέλης: 'riding horse' or 'fast-sailing yacht') still formed part of such a wish and it can not possibly have been compressed in the eight syllables that remain after "Υρρα.

The letter that follows δον is not completely wiped out. There is a horizontal stroke from the top of the ν to the right and a trace of a vertical stroke running parallel with the leg of the ν. Merkelbach (94) explains the horizontal stroke as a connecting line rather than the trace of a τ. Page, on the other hand, comments (*SLG*): "T veri sim. (non α, ε, η, ι, ο, υ, ω)". I think Page is right; at any rate I agree that the letter was not a vowel. In that case, however, the scribe made a mistake somewhere, since the third syllable of the line has to be short. This lends probability to Lloyd-Jones' suggestion that "Υρραδον is a mistake for 'Υρράδιον and that a substantive like γένεθλον followed. Now γένεθλον may have filled the end of the line, but I would think rather of τέκος, immediately following 'Υρράδιον. In this way we are rid of the abnormal "Υρραδον, the metre is correct and the letter after the ν is at least not contrary to the traces.

Whatever the solution of this problem, nobody doubts that in this line Pittacus is attacked, not even Gallavotti, though he denies that Pittacus was born from a father named Hyrras. He adopts the suggestion of Di Benedetto that both ὕρραος and ὑρράδιος (or ὕρραδος) mean 'bastard'.

I cannot believe Gallavotti's theory. It is true that Hesychius' lemma ὑρράδιος is puzzling (ἀπό τινος τῶν προγόνων ἄδοξος ἢ εἰκαῖος. "Υρρα παιδίον) and that Τινάδιος, son of Τίνας, offered as an extra example of the Aeolic patronymic by a scholiast of Dionysius (Schol. Vat., *Gr. Gr.* III 21) seems rather fictitious. On the other hand, Rösler (186-191) right-

ly argues that there is no reason to assume, as Gallavotti does, that there was something amiss with Pittacus' parentage. Moreover, in the poem ascribed to Callimachus by Diogenes, Ὑρράδιος clearly indicates the name of Pittacus' father. Must we then imagine that Callimachus, who still knew the bulk of Alcaeus' work and undoubtedly had many more sources of knowledge than we do, mistook an invective for a patronymic? I think this hardly probable.

Epilogue

The publication of the Cologne-papyrus excited much enthusiasm, understandably, since the fragment is exceptionally long and the possibility to combine the texts of two papyri over a number of lines is a rare, though not unique, chance. Still we must bear in mind that, even when both texts are combined, no single line is complete and that only two or three of the numerous supplements that have been proposed seem reasonably sure. That is why I do not print a 'Lesetext', as Merkelbach and Page (*SLG*) did. Such a text suggests, despite the brackets, a wholeness that is not there. Fr. 298 contains the remnants of a poem, not a poem. The fragment shows us that myth may play a role in Alcaeus' political poems but this comes hardly as a surprise. We should like to know exactly which parallel Alcaeus wanted to draw between myth and reality and how the myth was embedded in the poem. Both questions are only partially answered.

As for the first question, Podlecki (81) comments that we had better admit "that we have no idea why the son of Hyrrhas apparently found a place in a poem dealing with one of the legends of Troy." Though I am inclined to be very cautious myself, I think this statement exaggerated. The data are scarce, but not so scarce that we cannot even try to have an idea.

I think it plausible, as I have indicated above (ad 2-3), that Alcaeus means to convey that Pittacus, like Aias in the mythical past, ought to be stoned. But there is another question we cannot answer with certainty: who are invited to do the stoning? Most commentators are not very outspoken on this point. Only Burnett (199-200) confidently states: "In imagination Alcaeus here seems to address all the noblemen of Mytilene, asking them to treat Pittacus as any community must treat one who has outraged the gods." I do not believe this. Alcaeus' own companions, too, were noblemen of Mytilene, but I do not suppose his summons was addressed to them. Or at any rate, *if* it was, the parallel with the myth does not hold good.

Aias was a partisan of the Greeks and therefore they shared the respon-

sibility for what he did. They failed to punish him and thus became accessories to his crime. Now we do not know exactly which crime of Pittacus Alcaeus had in mind; it may have been his desertion to Myrsilos and his subsequent participation in illegitimate power. But it is sufficiently clear that Pittacus was an enemy, no longer a partisan, of Alcaeus and his peers. Not they themselves but only the friends of that enemy (or at least those people who did not condemn his conduct) could be accessories to the crime and run the same risk that the Greek army once ran. I think, therefore, that Alcaeus sang to his friends that the citizens of Mytilene ought to stone Pittacus, instead of tolerating or even applauding his accession to power. Burnett herself remarks (200) that stoning was a 'communal, public' punishment (cf. above, ad 2-3). This, too, suggests that *all* Mytilineans are meant, not only the nobles. One does not expect a small élite to carry out such a public execution, but rather the people as a whole.

As for the second question: we cannot even guess how Alcaeus made the switch from myth to reality at the end of the fragment. We can only say something about the way the myth is introduced. If we assume (as I think we must) that this happens at v. 4, we may ascertain that the conclusion of the story comes first, serving as a link between reality and the story proper. But how precisely this conclusion passes into the beginning of the narrative we cannot verify. The transition seems rather abrupt, but we cannot really judge.

The only part of the poem that we can follow at least in outline is the mythical story itself, up to the breaking of the storm. Rösler points to the fact that Aias' name is not mentioned till v. 16 (if, indeed, it was mentioned there) and that Kassandra's is not mentioned at all. To him this is an indication that these names already occurred in the opening stanzas of the poem (cf. the commentary ad 2-3). I do not think this a conclusive argument, since Alcaeus clearly supposed the story to be known. For instance, the casual mention of Deïphobos' death only makes sense if the listeners knew who he was and why he was killed. Likewise, the audience probably knew, already at v. 5, that the sacrilegious man whom the Greeks failed to kill to their own detriment, could be no one other than Aias. If the story was known it did not matter that a name was introduced late or even not at all.

At the beginning of the narrative it is not the sinner but the victim and the goddess who are in the limelight. Kassandra clasps the chin of the goddess's statue, a suppliant's gesture. We do not hear why, but here again the listeners must have understood that she sought protection against the victorious Greeks. Athena is called, an adjective that occurs only here, 'with much booty', 'giving much booty'. Lloyd-Jones com-

pares the Homeric ἀγελείῃ; Kramer-Hagendorn only comment: vox nova. We might ask, however, why the goddess is furnished with just this epithet, since it hardly underlines her function as a saviour. If we assume that it is not purely ornamental, the adjective perhaps stresses the fact that, even in the eyes of a goddess who bestows the spoils of war, not all kinds of looting are allowed.

Before Aias is introduced the perspective is widened and we hear (11-15) what happened elsewhere in the conquered city. Alcaeus wants us to know whence Aias came when he entered the temple: out of a town that was already full of death and lamentation. The temple scene is placed against a background of violence, and in this way its impact is greatly enhanced.

In the next two stanzas the fatal crime is described. The poet does not expatiate on the act itself. Nothing is said of Kassandra's reactions. We are only, once again, reminded of the fact that she stood at the statue of the goddess. Athena is Aias' opponent, her implacable hatred against 'robbers of a god' is strongly emphasized. When he is introduced, Aias is represented as a madman (16); in 20 his brutal greediness appears from the fact that he seizes his prey with both hands (cf. Burnett, 203-4). At the end of the description his madness is confirmed by the words: 'he did not fear ... the goddess who dispenses war'. A man who does not fear such a terrible adversary is clearly insane.

Up to here the story is told effectively. We are impressed with the power of the goddess and the enormity of Aias' behaviour, and that is the important thing. In this way Pittacus' crime is made to seem far greater than a treacherous move in the political play: it is put on one level with an offence against the gods, which cannot escape punishment, as Athena's reaction makes clear. The gist of the mythological story is, according to Kirkwood (98), not "the Greeks should have punished Aiax", but "deity punishes the wicked". That is true for this part of the story, but it is not finished yet. We may assume that the following stanzas related how Athena's revenge, prepared in the closing lines of O, caught *all* the Greeks, not merely the wicked man but all those who had condoned his crime.

In conclusion, a few words on the language of the poem. The syntax is simple, as always in Alcaeus. The ends of the stanzas coincide with a syntactic boundary, except (probably) the end of the sixth stanza. Metaphors hardly occur. There are, as one would expect in view of the subject of the poem, Homeric reminiscences. Voigt quotes nine *Similia* from Homer, but instances as ἄμφω χεῖρε or Πρίαμοιο πάις seem hardly significant. The most remarkable Homeric phrase is λύσσαν ... ὀλόαν ἔχων, words that occur in *Iliad* I 305 to describe Hector's state of mind.

Maybe v. 13 is an echo of *Iliad* X 447 (οἰμωγῆς ἀπὸ πύργου) and v. 14-15 of Π 78-79 (οἳ δ' ἀλαλητῷ πᾶν πεδίον κατέχουσι). The epithet οἴνοφ is Homeric and so is ὑπ' ὄφρυσι (cf. Page, 1955, 285). In my opinion, however, one cannot say that the language of the poem is dominated by epic idiom. When Lloyd-Jones (136) speaks of a 'pervasive influence of the epic', I think this too strong an expression.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

S. C. Bakhuizen, *Studies in the Topography of Chalcis on Euboea*, Leiden 1985.
W. Barner, *Neuere Alkaios-Papyri aus Oxyrhynchos*, Hildesheim 1967.
——, "Zu den Alkaios-Fragmenten von P. Oxy. 2506", Hermes 95, 1967, 1-28. [AF]
Anne Pippin Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets. Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*, London 1983.
A. M. van Erp Taalman Kip, "Some Remarks on Alcaeus fr. 298 (Voigt)", Mnem. IV 37, 1984, 1-13.
R. L. Fowler, "Reconstructing the Cologne Alcaeus", ZPE 33, 1979, 17-28.
R. Führer, [Review of Page SLG], GGA 229, 1977, 1-44.
——, "Zum Kölner Alkaios (S. 262, 24 Page)", ZPE 57, 1984, 41.
C. Gallavotti, "Auctarium Oxyrhynchium", Aegyptus 33, 1953, 159-171.
——, "Aiace e Pittaco nel carme di Alceo", BPEC n.s. 18, 1970, 3-29. [Gall.]
B. Gentili, [Review of Page *PMG*, *LGS* and *SLG*] Gnomon 48, 1976, 740-751.
R. Hirzel, "Die Strafe der Steinigung", Abh. phil.-hist. Klasse der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften 27, 1909, 223-266.
G. Huxley, "Aigai in Alkaios", GRBS 10, 1969, 5-11.
G. M. Kirkwood, *Early Greek Monody. The History of a Poetic Type*, Cornell U.P. 1974.
L. Koenen, "Alkaios: P. Köln II 59 and P. Oxy. XXI 2303", ZPE 44, 1981, 183-184.
B. Kramer-D. Hagedorn, *Kölner Papyri* (*P. Köln*), Band 2, Opladen 1978, 31-39.
H. Lloyd-Jones, "The Cologne Fragment of Alcaeus", GRBS 9, 1968, 125-139.
E. Lobel, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXI, London 1951, 85-87. [e.p.]
E. Lobel-D. Page, *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*, Oxford 1955. [*PLF*]
W. Luppe, "Ἀνάγκα im Kölner Alkaios", ZPE 33, 1979, 29-30.
R. Merkelbach, "Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der christlichen Lyrik", APF 16, 1958, 91-98.
——, "Ein Alkaios Papyrus", ZPE 1, 1967, 81-93. [M., Merk.]
——, "Nachträge zu Band 1", ZPE 2, 1968, 154. [M. 1968]
D. Meyerhoff, *Traditioneller Stoff und individuelle Gestaltung. Untersuchungen zu Alkaios und Sappho*, Hildesheim 1984.
D. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, Oxford 1955.
——, *Lyrica Graeca Selecta*, Oxford 1968 [*LGS*]
——, *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis*, Oxford 1974. [*SLG*]
A. J. Podlecki, *The early Greek Poets and their Times*, Un. of British Columbia Press 1984.
C. Robert, *Die griechischen Heldensage*, Berlin 1920-21.
W. Rösler, *Dichter und Gruppe. Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios*, München 1980.
——, [Review of Meyerhoff], GGA 237, 1985, 149-162.
S. R. Slings, "Ἀπαππένα γενήω: Some Problems in Lesbian Grammar", Mnem. IV 32, 1979, 243-267.
K. Strunk, "Historische und deskriptive Linguistik bei der Textinterpretation", Glotta 49, 1971, 191-216.
G. Tarditi, "L' ἀσέβεια di Aiace e quella di Pittaco", QUCC 8, 1969, 86-96.
M. Treu, "Alkaios: Vier Fragmente. Die mythischen Balladen des Alkaios", in: *Antike Lyrik*, herausgegeben von W. Eisenhut, Amsterdam 1971.
E. M. Voigt, *Sappho et Alcaeus*, Amsterdam 1971.

F STESICHORUS

THE LILLE PAPYRUS

Introduction: 1. The Papyrus

To understand the importance of this papyrus one must recall the labours and frustrations of previous editors of the fragments of Stesichorean poetry. In 1841 Bergk printed (I exclude the one-word-fragments quoted by lexicographers) 53 snippets: the longest contains 6 verses. In 1962, more than a century later, when Page produced his *PMG*, the situation was essentially the same: only two tiny pieces had been added by direct tradition: *P. Oxy.* 2359 = *Suotherae* and *P. Oxy.* 2360 *Nostoi*. In 1967, however, the remains of three other poems were published by Lobel: *P. Oxy.* 2617 = *Geryoneis*, *P. Oxy.* 2618 = *Eriphyle*, *P. Oxy.* 2619 (+ 2803) = *Iliupersis*; they were incorporated by Page in his *SLG* of 1974. But even then the longest continuous fragment numbered just 12 lines of text. So it is understandable that the specialists in the field became very excited when in 1976 a new piece became known, consisting of no less than thirty-three virtually intact lines, with remains of another ninety-two lines.

Honour is due to the team of French scholars who discovered this poem: Ancher-Boyaval-Meillier. The papyrus strips (P. Lille 76) were recovered from a cartonnage of a mummy which had been taken from Egypt to France at the beginning of this century, by Jouguet and Lefèbre. The three scholars published it in 1977 (Ancher 1977); they had taken care to ask help from experts in several countries. Unfortunately, however, they decided not to accept one particularly important piece of advice given by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, viz. to read the fragments on the three strips (initially and arbitrarily labelled A-B-C) in the order A-C-B; to put it more precisely: Ai, Aii, Aiii + Ci, Cii + B, together forming four *consecutive* columns of text. They stuck to their own considerations based on the texture of the papyrus, the alignment of the lines and the length of the columns and decided on the order B-A-C, assuming wide gaps (4 or 5 columns) between B and A and between A and C. — They were able to add two new (small) fragments: P. Lille 73 (see Meillier 1977b) and P. Lille 111c (see Ancher 1978).

Then Parsons, assisted by Lloyd-Jones and Barrett, decided to prepare another edition, and did so with laudable speed within the same year: Parsons 1977. This edition has become the basis for all subsequent work,

and his arguments (8-11) for the order A-C-B have not been seriously contested afterwards. In 1979, at the FIEC-congress in Budapest, Parsons presented a 'mise au point' of this papyrus (= Parsons 1983) which is as compact as it is useful.

Papyrologically speaking, the work has been done now, and done very competently. The present undertaking aims only at expanding the basis for a better understanding of the text, and does not pretend to present the papyrological evidence as such in a new light. The author's observations are based on extensive study of the photographs as well as of the original at Lille.

Two points concerning the papyrus should be touched upon briefly here. First, the dating. There are two criteria (a) the documentary text on the verso and (b) the handwriting of the scribe who copied the Stesichorus poem on the recto. After a careful examination of (a) and (b) in the framework of an analysis of the literary handwritings in the third and second centuries B.C., Turner suggested an early dating, perhaps as early as 250 B.C. Second, the scribal practice as evident in this papyrus: all there is to say can be found in Parsons 1977, 11.

2. *The Language*

As has been cogently argued by Ruijgh (1980: passim), the language of Greek archaic lyric poetry is never a purely local dialect (not even in the cases of Corinna and Sappho). Elements from Homeric language in the first place and from the prestigious Aeolic (Lesbos) and Doric (Sparta, Corinth) musical tradition were adopted and integrated, by each poet in her/his own personal way. Each of them learnt her/his trade by taking over not only the melodies and the metrical frames but also the mythic material and the language elements hallowed by the successful use to which predecessors had put them.—A more specific analysis of Stesichorus' language has been given by Nöthiger (he did not yet know the text found on this Lille papyrus).

Here I confine myself to a few lists which, put together, give a linguistic 'stratigraphy' of the language used by the author of this poem.

1) *Homeric* is, first of all, the way in which the initial digamma is 'respected' in ἔλπίδας 203, ἄναξ 209, ἀλοίσαν 217, ἕκατι 224, ἄνακτος 229, ἕλικας 272, Ἴσθμον 229 (cf. Ruijgh 1967, 142 n. 210 and Gallavotti (1977a, 11), and is disregarded in other cases:—δᾰ́ς ἰδέσθαι 211, ἐσιδεῖν 214, καῐ ἄστυ 228, -οι' ἄνακτος 275, 280.

Another epic feature is the use—according to metrical necessities—of the Ionic dative plural in -σι(ν) in the 1st and 2nd declension: βροτοῖσιν 206 and 290, φραδαῖσιν 227, φίλοισι 249; the cases of the shorter form are

μεγάροις 216, ἐμοῖς μύθοις 218, μύθοις ἀγανοῖς 232, μεγάλαις 270,].υχαις 301. Finally, the omission of the temporal augment in θέσαν 205, φάτο in 232 and 291, στεῖχεν 295 (ἔγειρεν 197 and ἔχεν 283 may be Doric infinitives in -εν instead of -ειν); there are more cases in which the temporal augment *is* used: ἐπεκλώσαν 212, ἐπίθοντο 234, ἔθορε 251, ἔειπε 253, ᾤχετ' 293, ἤνθον 303. That the text of this poem has a striking Homeric 'colouring' not only from the phono-morphological point of view but also and most pervasively in its phraseology, will be set out in the commentary.

2) *Aeolic* is -οντγα 〉 οισα as in ἀλοίσαν 217, ἐνέποισα 232, π̣[αύο]ι̣σα 233. But the same mechanism is not applied in πιθήσας 256.

3) *Doric*: πρᾶτος 214, αἰ (instead of εἰ) 211, ἐγών (instead of ἐγώ) 219, ῡμίν (ὑμῖν) 219, τόκα (τότε) 214, γα (γε) 209; ἤνθον (ἦλθον) 303; a short vowel in the ending of acc. fem. plural Κλεωνάς 303 (for εὐέθ]ε̣ιρας ἵππους 243, compare my note ad loc.) and not one certain case of -ᾱς: μερίμνας 201, βαρείας 203, μαντοσύνας τέας 209, πάσας 210 are all long by position. Local Dorisms ('Sicilianisms') which are attested for Stesichorus (πέποσχα PMG 261, εἶν *SLG* 15i7 and εἴμειν *SLG* 102,5) are not found in this papyrus. The writing μᾶλα 241 is more probably a hyperdorism coming from the scribe rather than an original 'sicilianism'; the latter is defended by Gallavotti 1977a, 9-10, on the strength of the consistent μᾶλα in the manuscripts of Theocritus. But what a Hellenistic poet might write himself (the word μῆλα 'sheep' had by then disappeared from contemporary spoken Greek) is less accceptable in Stesichorus: see Ruijgh 1984, 85-87.

About the way in which Stesichorus' language and diction in this poem is conditioned by the dactyloepitrite metre see Haslam 1978. The reader is referred to the same publication for matters of metre, prosody and strophic composition.

The Text

PLille 76Ai

[=]

]
]
]
]
]
]
]

[-]

] Κρονίδας μὲν
]
].ς υἱός
]
].ας ἐνθεῖν
]
].

[-]

]
].υτας
]
]...πρὶν
]
μ]ẹ́γα νεῖκος
]

[=]

]..εν εἴσω
]...
]παίδας
]
]
]
].[].

[-]

].ος ἔγειρεν
]
].....
]

PLille 76Aii + 73i

ἐ̣π' ἄλγεσι μὴ χαλεπὰς ποίε̣ι̣ μ̣ε̣ρ̣ίμνας
μηδέ μοι ἐξοπίσω
πρόφαινε ἐλπίδας βαρείας.
—
οὔτε γὰρ αἰὲν ὁμῶς
θεοὶ θέσαν ἀθάνατοι κατ' αἶαν ἱ̣ρ̣ὰν
νεῖκος ἔμπεδον βροτοῖσιν
οὐδέ γα μὰν φιλότατ', ἐπὶ δ' ἀμ̣ε̣ρ̣α̣⟨ι ἐ⟩ν νόο̣ν̣ ἀ̣ν̣δ̣ρῶν
θ̣ε̣ο̣ὶ̣ τιθεῖσι.
μαντοσύνας δὲ τεὰς ἄναξ ἑ̣κ̣ά̣ε̣ργ̣ο̣ς Ἀπόλλων
μὴ πάσας τελέσσαι.
==
αἰ δέ με παίδας ἰδέσθαι ὑπ' ἀλλάλ̣ο̣ι̣σ̣ι̣ δ̣αμέ̣ν̣τ̣ας
μόρσιμόν ἐστιν, ἐπεκλῶσαν δὲ Μοῖ̣ρ̣α̣[ι,
αὐτίκα μοι θανάτου τέλος{ο}στυγ̣ε̣ρ̣ο̣[ῖο] γ̣έ̣ν̣[οιτο,
πρίν ποκα ταῦτ' ἐσιδεῖν
ἄλγεσ⟨σ⟩ι πολύστονα δακ̣ρυόεντ̣α̣[——
παῖδας ἐνὶ μμεγάροις
θανόντας ἢ πόλιν ἁλοίσαν.
—
ἀλλ' ἄγε παῖδ̣ε̣ς ἐμοῖς μύθοις φίλα[—⏑⏑——
τᾷ̣δε γὰρ ὑμὶν ἐγὼν τέλος προφα[ίνω,
τὸμ μὲν ἔχοντα δόμους ναίειν π.[⏑⏑—⏑⏑——
τὸν δ' ἀπίμεν κτεάνη
καὶ χρυσὸν ἔχοντα φίλου σύμπαντα [πατρός,
κλαροπαληδ̣ὸ̣ν ὃς ἂν
πρᾶτος λάχηι ἕ̣κατι Μοιρᾶν.
—
τοῦτο γὰρ ἂν δοκέω
λυτήριον ὔμμι κακοῦ γένοιτο πότμο[υ
μάντιος φραδαῖσι θείου,
αιτενεον Κρονίδας γένος τε καὶ ἄστυ [⏑——
Κάδ̣μου ἄνακτος
ἀμβάλλων κακ̣ό̣τατα πολὺν χρόνον [—⏑⏑——]ς̣
πέπρωται γεν[.]..α̣ι̣.
==
ὣς φάτ[ο] δῖα γυνά, μύθ̣ο̣ι̣ς ἀγ[α]νοῖς ἐνέπ̣οισα̣,
νείκεος ἐμ μεγ̣ά̣ροις π̣[α̣ύ̣ο̣]ισα παῖδας,
σὺν δ' ἅμα Τειρ[ε]σίας τ̣[ερασπό]λος, οἱ δ̣ὲ̣ π̣ί̣θ̣ο̣[ντο

PLille 73ii + 76Ci
PLille 111C

αν̣[	]
το.[	]θ̣ηβαν
γαια[	]
και.[	]α
—	
τον̣[	χρ]υ̣σόν τ' ἐρίτιμον ἔχοντα
πα..	].σθενησαν
ηδ̣ρ̣σ.[	χ]λυτὰ μᾶλα νέμοντο
...[	]
.[.].μ̣[	].ιρας ἵππους
.[..].[	]
.[	]
—	
.[	]
.[	]..ους ἀσάμ̣ους
	]
	].ι στήθεσσι φίλοισι
	]
	].ο , ἂν δ̣' ἔ̣θορ' α̣ὐ̣τὸς
	]
[=]	
	μ]ῦ̣θον ἔειπε
	].λ̣ως
	].ατε βουλὰν
	]
	]ι̣ς πιθήσας
	]
	]
[–]	
	]ε πολλὰ̣ γὰρ̣ ὑμ̣ὶ̣ν
	]
	]
	]
	]σας
πολλά[	]
θεοὶ δομεν̣[	]
—	
τῶν ταμ̣[	]
ἀγεν̣τ̣α̣δ̣[	]ξ̣αις
πολλὰ δ[	]

PLille 76Cii + B

.[c. 10]υ̣σ̣ιν θέντες μ̣εγάλαις ε.[——
.[ ]γος
.[ ].εν ἕλικας βόας ἠδὲ καὶ ἵπ[πους
.[ ].αισαν
=
..[c. 9].οι τὸ μόρσιμόν ἐστι γεν̣[——
...[ ].ον Ἀδράστοι' ἄνακτος
.[ ].ος δωσεῖ περικαλλέα κο̣[ύραν
.[ ]α̣
.[ ]τ̣ον δωσοῦντι δᾶμος
..[ ]ο̣υ̣
]οι' ἄνακτος
[-]
]ω διαμπερέως Ἐτεο[κλ–
].εν στήθεσσιν αἰνω[
θ̣.[ ].ν ἔχεν Πολυνείκεος [——
ω.[ ].
τευ̣ξ[ ]ταν πόλει τε πάσαι
μα.[ ].ν
ἀεὶ π.[ ]ε πένθος
–
του[ ].ν̣
θεω̣[ ].σ̣ηι μάλιστα παντῶν
..[ ]τοισιν.
ὣς φάτ̣[ο Τειρεσίας ὀ]ν̣υμάκλυτος, αἶψα δ'α[——
δόμω.[ ]
ωἴχετ[ο].το φίλωι Πολυνείκεϊ τ[——
Θηβα̣ι̣.[ ]
=
...ομ.[ ].ν̣ σ̣τεῖχεν μέγα τεῖχ[ος ⏑——
.....[ ].... α̣ὐτῶι
π̣ο̣λ̣λ̣α̣ς̣[ ].. πποιστισα̣νακρο.
α̣ν̣δ̣ρ̣ε̣.[ ]
π̣ομπ.[ ].δ' ἵκοντο Ἰσθμὸν
Γ̄ ποντιο.[ ]
χραι..[ ].υχαις
–
X αυτ.[ ]ἄστεα καλὰ Κορίνθου
ῥίμφα δ' [εὐκτιμένας] Κλεωνὰς ἦνθον

Supplements and conjectures

Not listed are suggestions made in 1976 and 1977 which have been confirmed or rejected as a result of a more precise grasp of the papyrological evidence, in the first place due to the addition of fr. 73, and in the second place due to the results of infra-red photographs.

207 ἐπὶ δ' ἀλλοῖ' ἂν νόον Meillier, Slings ἐπὶ δ' ἀλλοῖα ννόον Meillier ἐπὶ δ' ἀμέρα⟨ι ἐ⟩ν νόον Parsons.
214 ποχα coni. West.
215 δαχρύεντα coni. Ruijgh.
215 δαχρυόεντα [τ' ἄλγεα Tosi [λυγροῖς Barrett [τ' ἔργα Barigazzi, Bousquet, Bossi [τ'ἄθλα Meillier [χάδεα Pavese [πότμον Gallavotti; δαχρυόεντ' ἄ[ελπτα Ritoók ἀ[γεῖσαν Slings ἀ[λάστοις Barrett ἄ[χεσσι Sisti.
218 φίλα [νεύσατε χρᾶτα Gargiulo [τέρματα χείσθω Gallavotti [νῦν φρονέοιτε Barigazzi [εἴδετε θύμωι Pavese [εἴδετε μήδεα Sisti, Riccardelli [τέχνα, πίθεσθε West, Maltomini.
219 ὔμ⟨μ⟩ιν e.p., Parsons.
220 πα[τρώϊα τ' ἔργα Meillier πα[τρῷα τε ἔργα Ancher πα[ρ' εὐχτίτωι ἄστει Gargiulo πό̣[λιν εὐχλέα Κάδμου Gallavotti πα̣[τρίοις ἐνὶ Θήβαις Diggle πα̣[ρὰ νάμασι Δίρχας Barrett πε̣[ριχαλλέας ἀμέων Barigazzi πό̣[λιν εὐρυάγυιαν Sisti.
222 [πατρὸς post Ancher omnes.
228 αἴ γ' ἐτεὸν Barrett, Lloyd-Jones; ἄστυ [τινάσσει Gallavotti [σαώσει Barrett, Lloyd-Jones, West [φιλήσει Slings [φυλάξει Barigazzi [ρύοιτο Meillier.
230 [αἴτ' ἀσινῆ δάν Ancher
[αἴτε χαὶ ἄλλως Gallavotti
[αἴτ' ἔτι δηρὸν Meillier } + 231 γενέ̣[σ]θ̣αι
[αἴτε πάλαι δὴ Slings
[ἃ βασιλείαι Lloyd-Jones } + 231 γενέ̣[θ]λ̣αι
233 π̣[αύο]ι̣σα Barrett εἴ[ργο]ι̣σα Parsons λ̣[ύο]ι̣σα Pavese.
234 τ̣[εράσπο]λος Barrett; οἱ δ̣' [ἐ]π̣ί̣θ̣ο̣[ντο (vel [ἀ̣]π̣ί̣θ̣η|σαν?) Barrett.
240 πρ]όσθεν ἦσαν Lloyd-Jones ε]ὐ̣σθένησαν Parsons ἔντ]ο̣σθ' ἔνησαν Page.
241 περιχ]λυτὰ Gallavotti; μῆλα West μᾶλα servare mavult Gallavotti.
243 εὐεθ]ε̣ίρας West.
247 χρη]σ̣μοὺς Meillier.
254 ἄ]λλως Meillier.
255 (ἐ)πέ]φ̣ρ̣αδε Barrett.
270 ἄν]υσιν Parsons.

271 ἄλ]γος Barigazzi.
273 χα]τ' αἶσαν Haslam, Parsons, West.
274 γεν[έσθαι Lloyd-Jones, Pavese vel γεν[έθλαι Lloyd-Jones.
275 ἵξεαι ἐς δό]μον e.g. West.
276 ὅ[ς δέ σε δεξάμε]νος West; κο[ύραν Merkelbach, ceterique post eum.
278 τέμενος δ' ἄφα]τον e.g. West coll. Ζ 194; δᾶμος e.p., δ'ἄλλος Barrett.
280 'Αδράστ]οι' (vel Κάδμ]οι') Barigazzi.
285 τεύξ[ηι μεγάλαν αὐά]ταν πόλει κτλ. Page.
291 ὥς φατ[ο Τειρεσίας ὀ]νυμάκλυτος, αἶψα δ' ἀ[ναστὰς Parsons αἶψα δ' ἀ[νέστα West αἶψα δ' ἄ[μ' ἤιε (vel ἀ[π'ἤιε) Anchor αἶψα δ' ἄ[ποικος Page.
292 δόμων [ἀπενθὼν e.g. West [ὅ γ' ἥρως Page.
293 ὤιχετ[ο σὺν δ' ἄρ ἕπο]ντο φιλ.Πολ. τ[αγοὶ Page.
294 Θηβαίω[ν ἄριστοι Page.
296 ἅμ' αὐτωῖ Parsons.
297 τ' ἴσαν ἄκρο[ν Barrett, Meillier.
299 πομπα[ῖσι θεῶν Barrett.
300 ποντίου['Εννοσίδα West.
301 πολλαῖς σὺν ε]ὐχαῖς e.g. West.
303 [εὐκτιμένας] Barrett, West coll. Β 570.

176-200 About these isolated words (ten of them, scattered over 24 line-endings) no commentary is possible. Taken together (Zeus, son, to come, before, strife, inside, sons, provoked) they would seem to be part of direct discourse rather than of narrative. Judging from what may be supposed to be Stesichorus' customary arrangement of text over the stanzas (see Haslam 1978, 46), one might be tempted to think that Teiresias has begun his words in 169 and ends in 189, all within one triad, and that Iocaste's answer starts with the new triad (190). But nothing in these ten words makes it impossible that Iocaste is already speaking in 176. As long as no new evidence turns up, we cannot know which of the two hypotheses is correct.

201 χαλεπάς: the word does not just mean 'difficult' but refers to realities which are unbearably, even overwhelmingly, painful or grievous. This is at least the case in Homer: cf. Ξ 417 χαλεπὸς ... κεραυνός, Φ 335 χαλεπὴν θύελλαν and further Ε 384, β 193, ζ 169, λ 582, χ 177.

μερίμνας: in Homer this noun does not occur; there are three instances in the Homeric hymns and more than fifty in archaic poetry, thirty-five of them in the poems of the pessimist Theognis. The combination of μέριμναι with χαλεπαί occurs also in Hes. *Op.* 178 and Sapph. fr.

1,25 (in both cases the μέριμναι are the result of divine interference with human affairs). The word denotes anxious preoccupation, worry, "Angst".

ἄλγεσι: the ἄλγεα which torture her and to which she urges Teiresias *not* to add μέριμναι, must refer to everything she has gone through in the past: longer ago (the loss of her first husband Laius) and more recently (the revelation that it was her second husband who had killed Laius and that he was her own son, and probably Oedipus' death as well; for the whole situation, and vv. 220-222 in particular, seem to require that Oedipus has died only recently). See Epilogue 1.—For the figure of speech 'woe upon woe' cf. the oracle in Hdt. I 67,4 πῆμ' ἐπὶ πήματι; S. *Ant.* 595 πήματα ... ἐπὶ πήμασι; E. *Alc.* 1039 ἄλγος ἄλγει προσκείμενον and *Tro.* 596 ἐπὶ δ' ἄλγεσιν ἄλγεα κεῖται.

202 ἐξοπίσω: in Homer ὀπίσω refers to a place or direction backwards, i.e. towards realities which lie either (spatially) *behind* (at the back of) the speaker, or (temporally) in the future, *later*. The semantic aspect common to both usages is that one cannot see what is behind one's back nor what is still to happen in the future. For ἐξοπίσω as 'thereafter' see e.g. ν 144.

203 πρόφαινε: not simply 'show in advance'; the word often has a connotation of divine prophecy as for example in Hdt. I 210,1; III 65,4; VII 37,2; S. *Tr.* 849; X.*Cyr.* IV 5,15. Note the present imperative: she asks him *to stop predicting* her dreadful things.

ἐλπίδας βαρείας: the verb ἔλπομαι, 'to expect' is in some cases virtually equivalent to (a) 'to (anticipate with) fear': so in Π 281-2; P 238-9; in other cases it is (b) 'to hope': Γ 112; Ο 701-2.There has been a lively discussion about possible specific (i.e. pessimistic) overtones in ἐλπίς in archaic poetry: see J. Schrijen, *Elpis* (diss. Amsterdam 1965, in Dutch); —also West and Verdenius ad Hes. *Op.* 96; most recently V. Leinieks *Philologus* 28, 1984, 1-8. In this Stesichorean instance (there is no other in his frgs.) ἐλπίδας, specified by βαρείας, obviously comes in category (a).

204-208 The drift of this sentence seems to be as follows: Iocaste states that it is her firm conviction that the present feelings of rivalry and strife between Polynices and Eteocles will not be permanent: hate and love are states of the *changing* mind of man. Why is man's mind changing? Because it depends on the kind of day one is given by the gods, that is why.—In this paraphrase several difficulties are resolved in anticipation, and they will be discussed each in its turn. One of them, however, concerns the sentence as a whole, viz. the function of the particles which organize it. Is οὔτε preparing for, and answered by, οὐδέ (207) or δ' (207)? Bollack (Suppl., 10) prefers the second alternative and refers to Denniston 511 for the combination οὔτε ... δέ. It is obvious from my paraphrase that I prefer the first alternative, combining οὔτε with οὐδέ

and giving explanatory force to δ' (τὸ δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ γάρ, as scholiasts are wont to say). Although οὔτε ... οὔτε is, of course, the standard combination, οὔτε ...οὐδέ is not without parallels and Denniston's observation (193) that in these cases there is always something special about the second limb, e.g. a climax, applies here: Iocaste does not phrase her thoughts in a symmetrical way ("neither νεῖκος nor φιλότας are permanent"); she begins with νεῖκος, her dominant concern, and she says what she wants to say about it; only then φιλότας is mentioned, almost as an afterthought (although not unprepared, for there was the preparing οὔτε): "nor φιλότας for that matter (γα), no, certainly not (μάν)". Iocaste, being a mother, would very much have preferred a situation in which it would be possible for family relations to remain harmonious all the time, but that, alas, is not the case. Notwithstanding the emphatic γα μάν, this first half of 207 (closed by a strong caesura) is amost a parenthesis.

204 αἰέν (—⏑, hardly ever followed by a consonant) is in Homer a useful variant besides αἰεί (——). It is put in polar opposition with ἐπὶ ἁμέρᾳ of 207. The word ὁμῶς seems to stand almost as an enclitic after αἰέν ("not equally—always"), but its load extends also to ἔμπεδον in 206 ("not equally—permanent"). The phrasing is slightly redundant, anyway, but this redundancy has a rhetorical function in the immediate context: Iocaste wants to make her point as clearly as possible.

205 θεοὶ θέσαν: in I 637, λ 274, 555 and φ 11 this very same phrase is used (always in direct discourse) if a character wants to underline that something is irrevocable and definitive. So here the lack of permanence in human thoughts, feelings and relations is presented by the *aorist* θέσαν as a definitive fact. The actual mutability is presented as the effect of what the gods do every day: τιθεῖσι, *present* (208).

κατ' αἶαν ἱράν. Some comment is needed for (i) αἶα, (ii) ἱρά and (iii) the combination of both.

(i) There are two schools of thought: diachronic and synchronic. The orthodoxy (Frisk and Chantraine in their etym. dict.; also Ruijgh 1967, § 188 n. 46) is that there were originally two words, γῆ and αἶα (**aFya*) (perhaps comparable to Δῆ and Μήτηρ?) of which γαῖα then is considered to be a contamination. Haslam (1976) prefers a synchronic approach, i.e. within the practice of poets composing in an oral tradition. He points out that in Homer γαῖα occurs over 300 times in many different positions, but αἶα only at the end of the hexameter; most prominent among the thirty instances are πατρίδος αἴης (17 ×), and πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν. He then suggests that in the practice of epic poets the 'defective set' πατρὶς ἄρουρα (3 ×), πατρίδι γαίῃ (7 ×), πατρίδα γαῖαν (59 ×) had been supplemented by the genitive πατρίδος αἴης; on the basis of this new creation, πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν was developed, and even got formular status. If Haslam's explanation is cor-

rect (plausible it certainly is), then Stesichorus' phrase must be a further exploitation of this product of 'Kunstsprache'.

(ii) Besides many instances of ἱερός, ἱρός is found in Homer as the fixed attribute to Ἴλιος: nom. 5 ×, gen. 2 ×, acc. 15 ×; it is the only form of the adjective in Lesbian. Mycenean Greek had i-je-ro and its derivates. It is more probable that Stesichorus took it from Homer as an epicism than that he borrowed it from the Lesbian poets.

(iii) Now ἱ(ε)ρός is applied in epic to specific cities (Troy, see above; Thebes: A 366; Athens: Hesiod frg. 43 a 67; Tiryns: Hes. *Th.* 292), never to earth as a whole. In the formulaic system one finds γαῖα μέλαινα, γ. πελώρη, ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γ., πατρίδα γ.; further εὐρεῖα χθών, ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρηι. Not even in Hesiod's *Theogony*, where Earth looms large as an elementary divinity, is she called 'holy'. The nearest she gets is χθόνα δῖαν: Ω 532; Hes. *Op.* 479; *Aspis* 287; fr. 204, 63; χθὼν δῖα in Ξ 347 is active when Zeus is making love to Hera on her!). Meillier might have adduced all this when he (1978b, 39) suggested that one should take αἶαν ἱράν here as referring specifically to Oedipus' country; his argument is the parallel in Stesichorus himself (*PMG* 222 ii 6), ἱαρὰν Βοιωτίδα. But in the Lille papyrus the sentence is too obviously gnomic (θεοὶ θέσαν ... βροτοῖσιν, cf. Ω 525) to allow such a specific reference. It remains curious that everywhere else in archaic poetry ἱερός is used to denote a particular sacred location (city, island, temple, oracle: Alc. fr. 42,4 and 48,10; Pi. *P.* 4,6 and fr. 75,4; B. 2,2 and 10,35); we have to wait for S. *Phil.* 707 to see earth called 'holy'. Cf. Locher 63-71.

206-207 νεῖκος-φιλότας. It was inevitable that Bollack, when he had seen this text, discovered and deciphered in his own Lille, should claim for that it was influenced by, and so written *after*, Empedocles: "il paraît évident que le fragment est postérieur à la systématisation philosophique d'Empédocle ... il s'agit au plus tôt d'une œuvre du cinquième siècle" (77). Now it is beyond doubt that νεῖκος and φιλότας are keywords in Empedocles' poem περὶ φύσιος; see especially fr. 17,7-20; fr. 26,5-6; fr. 35,3-13 (alternative terms occur occasionally: κότος for νεῖκος, ἀφροδίτη for φιλότης, in 21, 7-8 and 22,4-9). But Empedocles is not the first to bring together Love and Strife.

In his long catalogue of negative cosmic forces. *Th.* 211-232, Hesiod includes Φιλότης and Ἔρις, although not yet in strict polarity (224; 228-9). More importantly, in the scanty remains of the epic *Thebaid* (fr. 2 A OCT, ed. Allen) Oedipus, when cursing his sons, affirms that they will not divide their father's inheritance in amiable friendship (ἐν ἠθείῃι φιλότητι) but that there will be fights between them (πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε). So the polarity was already an element of the epic presentation of the

story. Stesichorus generalizes this polarity into a gnomic sentence. Indeed it is far more probable that Empedocles, being an inhabitant of Sicily and thus in a good position to hear Stesichorus' poems sung, was inspired by him when he composed his own philosophical poem.

206 ἔμπεδον: the use of the adjective is predicative and proleptic. In later Greek a causative verb ἐμπεδόω emerges (X. *Cyr.* IV 2,8; Pl.*Lg* 684a6 etc.), even used in poetry (S.*Ichn.* 55-56 Radt; E.*IT* 790). In epic also the adjective is used to indicate the firmness of a state of mind: φρένες ἔμπεδοι κ 493; σ 215; and νόος γε μὲν ἔμπεδος ἦεν κ 240; Λ 813.

207 For **οὐδέ** and **γα μάν** see ad 204-208. Before this papyrus the only instance of γα in archaic poetry was Alcman, *PMG* 43.

After having studied the papyrus itself as well as excellent infra-red photographs, I read the second half of this verse as επιδαμ. . αννοοναν̣δ̣ρων. Consequently, I take the liberty not to discuss the various suggestions made in 1976-1977, before frg. 73 c was brought into play and before infra-red photography was used. It should be noted with all possible clarity as regards this transcript that

1) it is perfectly legitimate to read λλ instead of μ: although in this papyrus λλ generally takes up just a tiny bit more space than μ, there are cases where the width of λλ and μ is absolutely equal (e.g. the λλ in Ἀπόλλων 209 and μ in μῦθοις 218), and the ductus identical;

2) the letter after the μ/λλ is only partly there; it may be an epsilon, but looks rather like an omikron which is indeed slightly pointed at the top in this handwriting;

3) the trace of the next letter might equally well be the lower part of the vertical of a rho as of an iota.

There are only two likely readings:

A) επιδαλλοιαννοον and B) επιδαμεραννοον

A1) One may want to interpret the letters as ἐπὶ δ' ἀλλοῖ' ἂν νόον κτλ. Meillier (1977) did so, tentatively (following a suggestion of Ancher), and translated: "c'est de manière variable que, dans la conscience même, les dieux les établissent" (65). In the context the second-last word of his translation refers to νεῖκος and φιλότας: this cannot be ruled out. He takes ἀν as a preposition: in itself unobjectionable because ἀνὰ θυμόν is found 5 × in Homer. But "de manière variable" is an odd way of translating ἐπὶ ἀλλοῖα. — Slings (1978a) takes ἀν not as a preposition with νόον but as a prefix *in tmesi* with τίθεισι and explains: "ἀνατιθέναι signifie ici 'remettre, mettre à sa place' ... je traduis: 'Les dieux tournent et retournent l'esprit des hommes dans des directions diverses' " (423). Slings' way of interpreting ἐπὶ ἀλλοῖα is acceptable, but there is not a single parallel for ἀνατιθέναι νόον ἐπί τι; and, what is worse, ἀνατιθέναι cannot have the meaning Slings wants it to have. The *Lex. frühgr. Epos* (s.v. ἀνα,

col. 760) gives for this compound (5 instances): "aufstellen, weihen; anhängen; auflegen". The parallel quoted by Slings, Φ 535 αὖτις ἐπανθέμεναι, is not conclusive: the element 'again' is expressed by αὖτις, and not by -αν- (cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 148).

A2) Another interpretation of the same letters is to read them as ἐπὶ δ' ἀλλοῖα ννόον; so does Meillier 1978a, 44-45. He takes the double nu as a geminate writing of an initial liquid consonant, used to indicate the prosodic *long* value of the preceding *short* vowel. For this there is a parallel in this same Lille papyrus: ενιμμεγαροις (216), and F. Vian found τρεπετοννοος in one of the medieval MSS of A.R. (IV 620). It is a fact that this geminate writing frequently occurs in the Ptolemaeic papyri of Homer: Stephanie West (113, n. 97) gives a list of these cases: υδατιλλιερωι Λ 830; επιλλιθεου Ψ 202; υπολλιγυρηι Ψ 215; τεμμεγαλωι ι 426; ενιμμεγαρωι κ 5. Cf. also Chantraine *GH* I 70. So far everything seems to be in order, and why not, then, follow Meillier and interpret this phrase as: "the gods put the mind of men to different things"?

There are several obstacles:

(a) In most cases where this geminate writing is found, the two words are closely connected; but in this case ἀλλοῖα and νόον are independent.

(b) Chantraine (*loc. cit.*) qualifies his general statement about the geminate writing (and corresponding prosody of the preceding syllable) by saying: "un grand nombre de mots ne présentent jamais l'allongement devant la sonante initiale" and in this number he ranges i.a. λέχος, μάχομαι, μένος, μάκαρ, νόος.

(c) τίθημί τι ἐπὶ + acc. seems un-Homeric, cf. K 46: (Ζεὺς) Ἑκτορέοις ἄρα μᾶλλον ἐπὶ φρένα θῆκ' ἱεροῖσι (the ἐπὶ goes with ἱεροῖσιν, of course!); and φ 1 τῆι δ' ἄρ' ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε .. Ἀθήνη .. τόξον θέμεν κτλ.

(d) The final, and I think fatal, objection against both (A1) and (A2) is that in archaic poetry ἀλλοῖος is virtually always used in a polyptoton frame: Hesiod *Op.* 483 ἄλλοτε δ' ἀλλοῖος Ζηνὸς νόος; *ibid.* 824 ἄλλος ἀλλοίην αἰνεῖ (ἡμέρην); Pi.fr. 43,5 τῶι παρέοντι δ' ἐπαινήσαις .. ἄλλοτ' ἀλλοῖα φρόνει. Cf. also Semon. fr. 7,11; Pi.*O.* 7,95, *P.* 3,50 and 104, *I.* 4,5; B. 14,7 etc. In the very few instances where this frame is not used (for the frame in general cf. the monograph by Jutta Krause) the context always contains a definite indication of another period (aspect, etc.) with which the 'other quality' is contrasted: Semon. fr. 7,42 (ὀργήν ⟵⟶ φυήν δ' ἀλλοίην), Theogn. 217 (νῦν τῆιδε, τότε δ' ἀλλοῖος). Therefore the bare ἀλλοῖα cannot be taken to mean 'changeable', i.e. 'now of this quality and then again of another'; for that meaning ἄλλοτ' ἀλλοῖα would be required. The upshot of this discussion about (A1) and (A2) is that neither solution is acceptable. We turn to B.

(B) Its main proponent, Parsons, acknowledged from the start that the spacing of the letters allows only επιδαμεραννοον. Now this is unacceptable for metrical reasons: it ought to scan ⏑⏑–⏑̄⏑̄–⏑⏑. Therefore he supposed that the scribe had omitted two letters: επιδαμερα⟨ιε⟩ννοον. The arguments offered for this reading (see Parsons 1977 and 1983) are: (i) parallels, (ii) metre, (iii) context.

(i) Parallels. Epic poetry contains several instances of ἐπ' ἤματι, in the sense of: either (α) "in the course of one single day" K 48; T 229; β 284; Hes. *Op.* 43; or (β) "each day" μ 105; ξ 105; cf. also Heraclitus' famous saying ὁ ἥλιος νέος ἐφ' ἡμέρηι, fr. 6 D.-K.

There are two parallels for ἐντιθέναι τί τινι: "the gods put a mental state into people": I 637: σοὶ κακὸν/θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν θεοὶ θέσαν, and N 732: ἄλλωι δ' ἐν στήθεσσι τιθεῖ νόον εὐρύοπα Ζεύς/ ἐσθλόν. Cf. also Theogn. 429/30 φρένας ἐσθλὰς ἐνθέμεν, and Pherecrates fr. 146 K νῦν δ' ἄρτι μοι τὸ γῆρας ἐντίθησι νοῦν.

In other cases it is a human person who 'puts' a mental state 'into himself': Z 326 χόλον τόνδ' ἔνθεο θυμῶι (cf. also ω 248), and I 629 'Αχιλλεύς/ ἄγριον ἐν στήθεσσι θέτο θυμόν (cf. I 639; λ 102; ν 342; and Theogn. 966).

The following Homeric parallel is even more important:

σ 136 τοῖος γὰρ νόος ἐστὶν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων
οἷον ἐπ' ἦμαρ ἄγῃσι πάτηρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε,

imitated by Archilochus (fr. 131) in trochaic metre:

τοῖος ἀνθρώποισι θυμός, Γλαῦκε Λεπτίνεω πάϊ,
γίγνεται θνητοῖσ' ὁκοίην Ζεὺς ἐφ' ἡμέρην ἄγῃ.

It is well known that in epic phraseology one finds the expression δούλιον ἦμαρ, νόστιμον ἦμαρ, αἴσιμον ἦμαρ κτλ.: sometimes it is expressly said that it is Zeus who gives or takes (after a free decision, or 'forced' by fate) the νόστιμον ἦμαρ (α 9, τ 369), the αἴσιμον ἦμαρ (Θ 72, X 212). The next step is to affirm that the gods, sending such a day, influence the mind of man: e.g. ρ 322-3 ἥμισυ γάρ τ' ἀρετῆς ἀποαίνυται εὐρύοπα Ζεύς/ ἀνέρος, εὖτ' ἄν μιν κατὰ δούλιον ἦμαρ ἕλῃσιν. Compare also π 279-280. In this way of thought it is perfectly right to affirm, as Homer does and as Archilochus and Stesichorus do after him, that what is in man's mind depends on, corresponds with the quality of the day he is given by the gods.

For further reflexion on the archaic experience expressed in these utterances the reader is referred to Fränkel. From the rich contents of his exposition I take one quotation, in order to show how another poet (earlier than Stesichorus) went even one step further, viz. to say that man is so much the victim of the day which is upon him that there is no νοῦς in him at all:

ὦ παῖ, τέλος μὲν Ζεὺς ἔχει βαρύκτυπος
πάντων ὅσ' ἐστι καὶ τίθησ' ὅκῃ θέλει,
νοῦς δ' οὐκ ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισιν, ἀλλ' ἐπημέροι
ἃ δὴ βοτὰ ζόουσιν, οὐδὲν εἰδότες
ὅκως ἕκαστον ἐκτελευτήσει θεός (Semon. fr. 1,1-5).

N.B. Blaydes had conjectured ἐν instead of ἐπ' in line 3; West records this and refers to Ar.*Arch.* 556. In the light of the above discussion ἐν seems preferable indeed.

(ii) Metre. With Parsons' reading this lyric hexameter, after the masculine caesura, also has a secondary stop. In post-homeric hexametric poetry, especially Callimachus and Nonnus, this is a fixed rule (Maas § 93); Haslam (43 with n. 27) points out that as far as the papyrus allows us to see, Stesichorus observes the rule: D|⏓⏓–|⏓⏓–⏑⏑–×|| or D|⏓⏓–⏑⏑|–⏑⏑–×||.

(iii) Context. The reading of Parsons fits in the context like a key in a lock: it is *not for always* and in the same way that the immortal gods have put Strife on the sacred earth as a permanent entity for men, nor Love for that matter, no certainly not!—for the gods put the mind of men in (them) just *for one day*."—This forceful thought (rounded off effectively by 'Ringkomposition': θεοὶ θέσαν ... θεοὶ τιθεῖσι) is offered by Iocaste as an argument not to give up all hope for the future: relations need not remain so hopelessly entangled and blocked as they are now: people change by the day. In a passage in the last tragedy of the fifth century, put into Oedipus' mouth by Sophocles, the same thought is presented the other way round: relations are open and friendly now (between Athens and Thebe) but it is virtually certain that enmity and war will come because all sentiments in men are subject to change:

θνήισκει δὲ πίστις, βλαστάνει δ' ἀπιστία
καὶ πνεῦμα ταὐτὸν οὔποτ' οὔτ' ἐν ἀνδράσιν
φίλοις βέβηκεν οὔτε πρὸς πόλιν πόλει.
τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἤδη, τοῖς δ' ἐν ὑστέρωι χρόνωι
τὰ τερπνὰ πικρὰ γίγνεται χαὖθις φίλα. S.*OC* 611-5

209 **μαντοσύνας**: this noun normally refers to the '*art* of divination', cf. A 72, Pi.*O.* 6,66; even when it occurs in the plural, its meaning is essentially the same: B 832 = Λ 330, Emped. fr. 112,10 D.-K., perhaps with an overtone of pathos (cf. λελασμένος ἱπποσυνάων Π 776). Here, in the plural, it seems to mean 'oracles'. I have found no strictly comparable instance earlier than A.R. II 1135.

ἄναξ ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων: in Homer this formula occurs only 3 times; it is relatively more frequent in the Hom. Hymns (6 ×). Because of the

formulaic character of the expression (always as a nominative) it is less probable (though not impossible) that ἄναξ is used here in isolation as a vocative (not only ἄνα, Π 233, but also ἄναξ Β 284 is used as vocative). Parsons prefers to take ἄναξ as vocative ("τέας otherwise must take its reference from 201-3"). I prefer to suppose that Iocaste's speech is directed to Teiresias from 190 onwards (or even earlier, see my remarks ad 176-200); in 218 she switches from him to her sons.

210 πάσας: as the actual wording of Teiresias' speech is lost (even if 176-189 were its end, we would not be much the wiser for it), it is impossible to know the full extent (πάσας) of what he foretold. But from 211-212 at least this much is certain: he has told her that her two sons will kill each other: παῖδας ... ὑπ' ἀλλάλοισι δαμέντας μόρσιμόν ἐστιν. The text of 214-217 allows the interpretation that he has presented this to her in the form of a dilemma: "your sons will have to die, or else it will be the end of Thebes". See my remarks ad 217 ἤ and ad 227 μάντιος φραδαῖσι θείου.

μή .. τελέσσαι: Bollack's howler (he seriously considered taking this as "optatif sans ἄν exprimant la possibilité", ...) has come in for its punishment (see Slings 1978a, 431). It is of course a plain optative expressing a wish: "may Apollo not fulfil your prophecies". In the *Odyssey* there are three virtually identical parallels: μὴ τοῦτο θεὸς τελέσειε (ρ 399 = υ 344; δ 699). For the verb τελέω with 'oracles' as object, see Waanders 31-38 and 67.

211 αἰ instead of εἰ is normal in Alcman and in the Lesbian poets; in fact it is common West-Greek. As an Aeolism it has been used in epic poetry as well.

ἰδέσθαι: this is one of the cases covered by the theory of Bechert 426, VI: the middle infinitives ὁρᾶσθαι, ἰδέσθαι have an extra semantic aspect 'to see with one's own eyes', used in cases when the subject who sees is emotionally linked to, or impressed by, the spectacle he is watching. In 214 the experience expressed in 211 is simply referred to: ταῦτ' ἐσιδεῖν; then the active is normal.

ὑπό + dative is used in Homer to indicate the *instrument by which* (e.g. ἐμῶι ὑπὸ δουρὶ δαμέντα Ε 653, and also in the formulaic ὑπὸ χερσίν e.g. πολλοὶ δὲ δάμεν Δαναῶν ὑπὸ χερσίν Ο 2) or the *person by whom* (ὑπὸ Τρώεσσι δαμῆναι Ν 98). Chantraine (*GH* II 141) notes that — although there are cases in which the purely functional construction of later Greek announces itself: passive verb + ὑπὸ, e.g. Π 490 — the concrete and spatial value of ὑπὸ still makes itself felt: "under the weight of".

ὑπ' ἀλλάλοισι δαμέντας: similar expressions (but no verbal echoes) of this Stesichorean half-verse are found in the tragedies which focus on the mutual killing of P. and E.: A. *Th.* 821, 930 and E. *Ph.* 1268-9.

212 μόρσιμόν ἐστιν: in another Stesichorean poem there is also some-

one who in the course of a discussion tries to find out the best way of dealing with τὸ μόρσιμον: Geryones in *SLG* 11,20-21; not enough of that text is preserved to allow a detailed comparison, but it is clear that there, too, a quick death is preferred to a miserable life.

ἐπεκλώσαν δὲ Μοῖραι: the phrase is apparently redundant after the μόρσιμον, but it is a parenthesis which explains in mythological terms the neutral μόρσιμον: again explanatory δέ (cf. ad 204-8). Thought and words are Homeric: ὡς γὰρ ἐπεκλώσαντο θεοὶ δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν Ω 525 and ὥς ποθι Μοῖρα κραταίη/ γιγνομένωι ἐπένησε λίνωι Ω 209-210. In the *Odyssey* there are five instances of the god (or δαίμων; not Μοῖρα) "spinning a fate towards" mortals: α 17; γ 208; θ 579; λ 139; π 64. In Homer Μοῖρα normally operates in the singular, and is interchangeable with Αἶσα: the sentence just quoted Ω 209-210 is found in Υ 127-128 with Αἶσα as its subject. It even is a matter of debate whether Μοῖρα in Homer is a personal deity at all; B.C. Dietrich, *Death, Fate and the Gods*, London 1965, 194-231, thinks she is, and connects her with an older goddess of popular belief; Nilsson, *Gesch. gr. Rel.* I[3] 362, denies this: "es kann keine persönliche, konkrete Göttin sein die mit solchen Wörtern (μοῖρα, αἶσα, μόρος) bezeichnet wird"; for his thesis that the personification is late he points to the fact that the evidence for any cult of the Μοῖρα(ι) does not antedate the fourth century BC. Similarly Chantraine, *Entretiens Hardt* I 1952 (1954) 71, (speaking about Homeric gods): "La μοῖρα ne se trouve jamais nettement promue au rang de divinité". But there is in the whole of Homer only one line in which we hear about the Μοῖραι in plural: τλητὸν γὰρ Μοῖραι θυμὸν θέσαν ἀνθρώποισιν Ω 49. Even more specific is η 197-198: πείσεται ἅσσα οἱ αἶσα κατὰ Κλῶθές τε βαρεῖαι γεινομένωι νήσαντο λίνωι. The spinning goddesses bear the name of their function. Hesiod (*Th.* 901-906) officially incorporates the Μοῖραι in the system as daughters of Zeus and Themis, and calls them Κλωθώ, Λάχεσις and Ἄτροπος. Archaic poets waver between plural and singular, sometimes even within one poem: Callin. fr. 1,9 and 15. And as late as the middle of the fifth century BC one still finds Μοῖρ' ἐπέκλωσεν: A. *Eum.* 334-5 and B. 5,143.

213-217 αὐτίκα ... ἀλοίσαν. This sentence is a specific variation on a Homeric theme; it is worthwhile to state the theme and to survey its variations. I follow the discussion given by Vagnone, although I disagree on details. Vagnone gives a full list of all Homeric passages (16) expressing a wish of death; but this is only an element of the theme itself which consists in someone saying that he/she wants to die before he/she has to be witness to a catastrophe. A clear case is the following: (Priam is speaking) αὐτὰρ ἔγωγε, / πρὶν ἀλαπαζομένην τε πόλιν κεραϊζομένην τε /

ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδεῖν, βαίην δόμον Ἄϊδος εἴσω Ω 244-6. In Z 344-8 and 464-5 Andromache and Hector utter a comparable wish of death. Closer to the syntax of Stesichorus' expression is Odysseus' exclamation in π 106-11 (duly and less forcefully echoed by Telemachus in υ 316-19; I do not agree with Vagnone, 39, that the latter passage is the 'original' one of the two):

βουλοίμην κ' ἐν ἐμοῖσι κατακτάμενος μεγάροισι
τεθνάμεν ἢ τάδε γ' αἰὲν ἀεικέα ἔργ' ὁράασθαι,
ξείνους τε στυφελιζομένους δμῳάς τε γυναῖκας
ῥυστάζοντας ἀεικελίως κατὰ δώματα καλά,
καὶ οἶνον διαφυσσόμενον, καὶ σῖτον ἔδοντας
μάψ αὔτως, ἀτέλεστον, ἀνηνύστωι ἐπὶ ἔργωι.

This splendid passage: "I would prefer to die rather than τάδε ἔργα ὁράασθαι", and then a specification of τάδε by a series of participial phrases has been Stesichorus' model. In the Homeric passage there is twice the lively switch from passive to active participles, the τρικυμία of the heavy hephthemimeres rhythm in 108-109-110, and the indignation in the final hexameter. This sublimity is not matched by the Himeraean poet, but he has written his variant in a way well characterized by Vagnone (42): "un riuso di schemi o formule tradizionali che la memoria poetica offrirà senza sforzo: una 'Erinnerung' che si situa a mezza strada tra la memoria ri-creatrice dell'aedo-rapsodo e la rielaborazione consapevole del poeta letterato". As a corollary I note two later prose variations on the theme: X.*An.* VII 1,30 and *Cyr.* V 5,9.

There is one last point to be discussed before passing on to the details of 213-217. Carlini (66) suggested that Iocaste is threatening to kill herself, in the same way in which she acts in Euripides' *Phoenissae*. To begin with the *Phoenissae*: 'blackmail with suicide' is out of the question there, for (i) in the long debate (435-637) under Iocaste's direction she utters not a single word in this direction, and (ii) in 1282 (the line is adduced by Carlini to prove his point) it is too late for a threat to have any effect (her sons are far out of her reach: Iocaste addresses Antigone in 1282). Now for Stesichorus. Does the text give any ground for the belief that Iocaste, by the threat of killing herself, wants to compel her sons into accepting the solution of the conflict she is going to suggest in 217-224? Meillier (1978b, 36) agrees with Carlini, but in my opinion the Homeric 'ancestry' of Iocaste's words pleads against it: in the Homeric cases the wish of death is a wish to escape from unbearable sorrow or shame by dying. In the context of this poem — as far as we have it — the wish of death is not an effort to exercise power through a suggestion of suicide — it is an expression of despair. But perhaps Segal (199) is right: "her

prayer may be a foreshadowing of her suicide": in Homer (λ 277-8), S.*OT* and E.*Ph.* she kills herself and for all we know, she may have done the same in Stesichorus' narrative. In Iocaste's attitude there is only one exceptional thing: her despair is conditional, in the strict sense of the word. Note that the protasis εἰ ... μόρσιμόν ἐστιν, ἐπεκλώσαν δὲ κτλ. is not in the optative (potential) but in the indicative: "if it is true that ..." In a recent textbook dealing with Greek syntax it is noted that "the use of the indicative often suggests a certain scepticism on the part of the speaker concerning the fulfilment" (Rijksbaron 69).

213 αὐτίκα. One is reminded of Achilles' αὐτίκα τεθναίην (Σ 98): situation and personality are different but the emphatic character of both statements, expressed by αὐτίκα as first word of the verse, is identical. Cf. also Penelope's death-wish: αὐτίκα νῦν (σ 203 = υ 63): she asks Artemis to make her die straightaway in order that she may meet Odysseus in Hades and need not become the wife of another, lesser man (υ 82). Less heroic is Mimnermus' wish to die as soon as his 'season' is over: αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν δὴ τοῦτο τέλος παραμείψεται ὥρης, / αὐτίκα δὴ τεθνάναι βέλτιον ἢ βίοτος (fr. 2,9-10).

θανάτου τέλος. The combination of words is Homeric, cf. Γ 309; Ε 553; Ι 411 etc. and ε 326; ω 124. In later Greek one finds βίου τέλος = the *end* of life, but in archaic Greek τέλος still has its meaning 'realization, execution, fulfilment'. See Waanders, 48-51 cf. also Hes. *Op.* 166, Theogn. 768.

θανάτου...στυγεροῖο: this combination is Homeric as well: πάντες μὲν στυγεροὶ θάνατοι μ 341 and στυγερὸν θάνατον ω 414. The same phrase in Stesichorus' *Geryoneis* (*SLG* 15 ii 1-2): στυγε[ρ]οῦ/ [θανάτοι]ο (the supplement is almost certain). Note how in both cases Stesichorus uses the genitive -ου or -οιο just as the metre requires: Kunstsprache indeed! A final remark: the papyrus has τελοcοστυγẹρ̣: the omicron is unmistakable, and of course a scribal error.

214 ποκα. West has pointed out that it is necessary to emend the scribe's τοκα into ποκα; the parallels are decisive, this time from tragedy: A. *Suppl.* 36-39 ὄλοιντο/ πρίν ποτε λέκτρων ... ἐπιβῆναι; S. *Ant.* 120-121 ἔβα πρίν ποθ' ἁμετέρων/ αἱμάτων γένυσιν πλησθῆναι, and *Tr.* 16-17 δύστηνος ἀεὶ κατθανεῖν ἐπηυχόμην/ πρὶν τῆσδε κοίτης ἐμπελασθῆναί ποτε. From two different points of view the writing τοκα has been defended: Meillier (1977c, 65 and 1978b, 15) translates "avant de voir *à ce moment-là*" (etc.), making the word τόκα refer to the precise moment of fratricide. Slings passed on to me a suggestion of one of his students at the Free University, Amsterdam: πρὶν τὸ κατ' αὔτ' ἐσιδεῖν "before I can see that (event) according to them (the prophecies of Teiresias)". Ingenious, but not convincing, because αὔτ(ά) cannot refer to μαντοσύνας. We shall have to accept that

this scribe, like most of his colleagues, occasionally made an error: the omission of ⟨ιε⟩ in 207, τοκα instead of ποκα here; the redundant omicron in 213; and the omission of a sigma in the next line.

215 ἄλγεσ⟨σ⟩ι. There is no doubt that the metre requires ——⏑; ἄλγεσι will not do. Note again the flexibility of morphology: likewise, Homer has βέλεσιν (Λ 657) besides βέλεσσιν (Α 42).

δακρυόεντα is metrically suspect. In all other verifiable cases of (x)Dxex in this poem (str. 2, 5 and ep. 2; thirteen attestations altogether) the syllable between D and e is really *anceps*, i.e. only—and ⏑ are attested. I am inclined to accept Haslam's view (1978, 39) that the responsion ⏖ (biceps) is reserved for the pseudohexameters. Now would it be possible to scan δακρύοεντα as —⏑—⏑? Gallavotti (1977a, 5) referred to Ἠλεκτρυώνης, scanned ———— in Hesiod (5 ×); then the ⏑ has no syllabic value but operates as semiconsonant. Possible. Barrett suggested to pronounce δακρυό̯εντα; Haslam loc.cit. n. 21: "this may be the answer". Or it may not; for there is no other case of ο̯ε in Stesichorus. Ruijgh has suggested to read δακρύεντα, and there are good reasons for doing so: *δακρύεις is the original form, for (i) the noun is δάκρυ, δάκρυον being the 'illegitimate offspring' of the plural δάκρυα and (ii) the suffix was originally -(*F*)εις, although in later periods one finds (apart from χαρίεις) only forms on -όεις and -ήεις; see Schwyzer I 527.

δακρυ(ο)εντα[——. This lacuna has stimulated the inventiveness of quite a few scholars. I shall deal with their suggestions in groups, according to the different syntactical constructions they assume. There are five who want to put in a substantive:

δακρυόεντα	[τ' ἔργα	Barigazzi e.a.	(1)
	[τ' ἆθλα	Meillier	(2)
	[τ' ἄλγεα	Tosi	(3)
δακρυόεντα	[κάδεα	Pavese	(4)
	[πότμον	Gallavotti	(5)

Supplement (1) draws its plausibility from the parallel with τάδε ... ἔργα in π 107, discussed above ad 213-217; cp. also Γ 130 and ι 295. One might object that this supplement disregards the effect of the digamma, but that is also the case in 211 (-δας ἰδέσθαι) and 228 (καὶ ἄστυ). Against (2) one might be tempted to point out that the uncontracted ἄεθλα is normal in Homer up to and including Pindar, but there are a few cases of ᾱθλ- already in Homer (λ 699; θ 160 etc.). As for (3), one might think that we have seen enough instances of this word in the few lines of Stesichorus so far; but Tosi lists seven parallels from tragedy (S. *Ai.* 362, 866; *El.* 235; E. *Hel.* 195, 365; *Or.* 1257; *Ph.* 1495) to prove that by accumulating forms of an identical noun (κακὸν κακῷ, πόνον πόνῳ, ἄταν

ἄταις etc.) Greek poets express the accumulation of evil. Supplement (4) is backed by A 445, but by nothing else: the coordinating particle is required for the two adjectives in this line. In (5) Gallavotti puts a comma before δακρυόεντα and one after [πότμον, taking these words to be an apposition to ταῦτα .. πολύστονα. A different solution is proposed by Ritoók (in a letter to me), viz. to read (6) δακρυόεντ' ἄ[ελπτα; he points to B. 3,29 as parallel: (Κροῖσος) ἐς ἄελπτον ἆμαρ/ μολὼν πολυδάκρυον οὐκ ἔμελλε/ μίμνειν ἔτι δουλοσύναν κτλ. But there πολυδ. is linked up with δουλ. and ἄελπτον with ἆμαρ; also there is the difficulty already noted in (4): this time no less than three uncoordinated adjectives. Supplement (7) δακρυόεντ' ἀ[γεῖσαν follows a suggestion of Parsons; πολύστονα δακρυόεντ' are then adverbial. The advantage of (7) is that for the first time ἄλγεσσι is assigned a satisfactory syntactic function; in all other supplements it can only have a vague rôle as 'comitative' dat. For the disregarded digamma see ad suppl. (1). But there are no other instances of passive forms of ἄγνυμι = 'crush' in a metaphorical sense.—Finally three suggestions with a dative to give some syntactical symmetry to the line:

δακρυόεντ'	ἀ[λάστοις	Barrett (8)
δακρυόεντα	[λυγροῖς	Barrett (9); again the uncomfortably free-roaming dative.
δακρυόεντ'	ἄ[χεσσι	Sisti (10), is a bold sophisticated

attempt, meant as "espressione asindetica con struttura chiastica" to match the balance of the two following participial constructions. Too neat and sophisticated to suit Stesichorus. If I had to place a bet, it would be on (1) because of π 107, and I would put small sums on (5) and (7) as well.

216 παῖδας ἐνὶ μμεγάροις. About the μμ, see ad 207. These three words occur in this order in Ω 603; γ 354; κ 5, and with slight variations in γ 401; φ 56.

217 ἤ. Is it an inexorable dilemma here: "either .. or?" Or a looser connection: "rather die than see how x or y happens"? In my comment ad 210 (πάσας) I have touched upon the question *what* exactly, in Stesichorus' version of the story, Teiresias has foretold. It is possible to frame a hypothesis as follows: in the passage preceding Iocaste's speech Teiresias has said "After Oedipus' parricide and incest it is impossible for his sons to reign over Thebes; if they insist on doing precisely that, the result is bound to be disastrous, for *either* their present quarrel about the succession will become worse and end in fratricide, *or* if that is avoided (i.e. if they stay together in Thebes, sharing royal power), enemies will come and take the city". This hypothesis fits the wording of 216-217 (and explains Iocaste's 'solution' of 226 ff.: there she offers a 'tertium', an escape from Teiresias' dreadful *either-or*). But it cannot be

verified or falsified unless new evidence turns up: for (i) the text of this papyrus fragment leaves us in the dark about Teiresias' actual words, and (ii) the scanty fragments of, and testimonia about the epics *Oidipodia* and *Thebais* do not give us any clue about an intervention by Teiresias at this point of the story. Apart from the fragments alluded to just now, C. Robert's massive *Oedipus* consists entirely of material from the fifth century BC and later. If, however, this hypothesis is correct, Stesichorus was the first to put the fate of the Labdacid family in a wider 'political' perspective: the choice between γένος and πόλις.

From Aeschylus' version of the story only the third play is preserved: there it is Apollo himself who puts the dilemma to Laius: Ἀπόλλωνος ... εἰπόντος ...(Λαίον) θνάισκοντα γέννας ἄτερ σώιζειν πόλιν (*Th.* 745-749). Teiresias is only mentioned in passing, but not as the private soothsayer of the family: he is the man who uses his special knowledge for the benefit of the polis (24-29). This same 'political' preoccupation is clear in S. *Ant.* 1015 νοσεῖ πόλις and in E. *Ph.* 867 νοσεῖ γὰρ ἥδε γῆ πάλαι; he apostrophizes Thebes: σύ τ' ὦ τάλαινα ... πόλι, 884. E. *Ph.* provides us with an even more specifically striking parallel, viz. between Creon's effort to find a way out of the dilemma γένος-πόλις, and Iocaste's in Stesichorus. In E. *Ph.* 898 Creon asks Teiresias φράσον πολίταις καὶ πόλει σωτηρίαν. Teiresias answers: σφᾶξαι Μενοικέα τόνδε δεῖ σ' ὑπὲρ πάτρας/ σὸν παῖδα (913-4). Creon refuses to listen: οὐκ ἔκλυον οὐδ' ἤκουσα. χαιρέτω πόλις (919). Teiresias explains that the γένος of the Spartoi has to pay for Cadmus' killing of the dragon, and ends by saying: ἢ γὰρ παῖδα σῶισον ἢ πόλιν (952). Creon's final stance is that he is fully prepared to die himself θνήισκειν ἕτοιμος πατρίδος ἐκλυτήριον (969); and he wants to get his son out of the country. All taken together his situation and reaction has much in common with Iocaste's in Stes., including one verbal coincidence: λυτήριον (Stes. 226) and ἐκλυτήριον (E. *Ph.* 969).

πόλιν ἀλοίσαν. We who in our life-time have heard about the sack of Berlin (1945), Hama (1982) and Beirut (1984-1985) know that the fall of a city and the subsequent behaviour of the 'victors' amount to a nightmare. In antiquity, too, this was well-known. In the *Iliad* (I 592-4) Phoenix makes Meleager's wife explain to her husband what will happen if the Curetes take the city (it is stated in general terms, note the epic τε):

κήδε' ὅσ' ἀνθρώποισι πέλει τῶν ἄστυ ἁλώηι·
ἄνδρας μὲν κτείνουσι, πόλιν δέ τε πῦρ ἀμαθύνει,
τέκνα δέ τ' ἄλλοι ἄγουσι, βαθυζώνους τε γυναῖκας.

Grim anticipation of victory is voiced by the Greeks: πόλις Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος/ χερσὶν ὑφ' ἡμετέρηισιν ἁλοῦσά τε περθομένη τε (Β 373-4 = Δ 290-291; Δ 291 = Ν 816). The Iliupersis became the subject-matter of a separate epic in the 'Cycle'; it was sung by Stesichorus (remains in *SLG*

88-132). In tragedy women tell about the horrors of this night in E. *Hec.* 905-951 and *Tro.* 511-567; Clytaemnestra sadistically elaborates on this theme in A. *Ag.* 320-337. Cf. also the chorus of A. *Th.* (women again!): 321-368.

218-224 At this point of the commentary it is possible and useful to take in the impact of what Iocaste has said so far and how that is related to what she is going to say. In fact one could compare the three parts of her speech to the movements of a sonata: Andante con moto, Adagio funebre, Allegro vivace. In the first part (as far back as we can read it: 201-210) she resists the impact of Teiresias' words: "Do not add to my sorrow—the unfortunate conflict between my sons need not be definitive and irremediable—I still hope that what you have said will not come true". In the second part (211-217) she almost surrenders to the prophecy: "If it is really inevitable that I shall see my sons killed by each other, then I want to die right now, before these tearful events happen: my sons killed—if not, then Thebes sacked!" In the third (218-231) she pulls herself together, addresses her sons and puts them on to a course of action which will, so she persuades herself to think, be a way out of the evil fate foretold by T., if only Zeus will save us, dynasty *and* city, and postpone evil until later (here I anticipate the result of a discussion to be held *ad* 228). From a psychological point of view, this ῥῆσις is a splendid piece; especially how at the nadir of despair (217-218) she switches from the minor into the major key. She overcomes the depressing effect of what religious authority has told her by the sheer vitality of her maternal hope and initiative (see comm. ad 224).

216 ἀλλ' ἄγε occurs about one hundred times in Homer, invariably as the first dactyl of the hexameter; always followed by an imperative of the second person, singular or plural, or by an adhortative subjunctive of the first person plural. This will be of importance when we have to appreciate the supplements suggested for the end of this verse (cf. *ad* φίλα).

ἐμοῖς μύθοις. In Homer μῦθος (and μυθέομαι) refer to speech which is not *per se* narrative; in fact it very often is exhortatory: e.g. ἦρχον ἐγὼ μύθοιο, κελεύων ὔμμ' ἅμ' ἕπεσθαι Λ 781, cf. als Γ 86-91. The result of such a speech is ἐπείθετο μύθωι Α 33; cf. Α 273: Υ 295 etc. The cases of μῦθος = narrative discourse are rare: Λ 643; φ 301.

φίλα | –⏑⏑–×. Six suggestions have been put forward five of which can be discarded; the remaining one seems to be a *palmaria*. The following discussion is partly indebted to Maltomini's excellent paper (1977).

1) φίλα [νεύσατε κρᾶτα Gargiulo
2) φίλα [τέρματα κείσθω Gallavotti
3) φίλα [νῦν φρονέοιτε Barigazzi

4) φίλα [εἴδετε θυμῶι Pavese
5) φίλα [εἴδετε μήδεα Sisti
6) φίλα [τέκνα, πίθεσθε West + Maltomini

Against (1)-(5) can be objected that in Greek someone (or something) is always called φιλος(-ν) to a *person*, φίλα φρονεῖν (etc.) τινί; in these five supplements, however, the χρᾶτα, τέρματα, μήδεα and the content of φρονεῖν resp. εἰδέναι are φίλα to μύθοις. The comment given above on the normal follow-up of ἀλλ' ἄγε (subjunctive 1st ps. plural, or imperative 2nd person sing. or plural) rules out (2), (3), and also (4) and (5) for εἴδετε can only be taken as a subjunctive. There are also more specific objections. Against (1) it can be pointed out that νεύω in the sense of 'to assent' is normally intransitive; in the few cases where the verb is followed by an accusative (or acc. cum inf.), this acc. refers to the object (or course of action) to which assent is given, cf. Θ 246, *Hy.Dem.* 445 = 463; in the only Homeric case of νεύειν κεφάλας Telemachus wishes that the Suitors will bend/drop their heads just as the beaten beggar Irus is doing then (σ 237). This is certainly not what Iocaste wants her sons to do.—As for (2), its inventor claims that it is 'confirmed' by τέλος in the next line. But τέρμα ≠ τέλος, see Waanders; and his supplement would make Iocaste say: "I now really want to *end* my speech!" In fact, she does not want to end it at all. If the proponents of (4) and (5), also perhaps of (3) take their text not to mean that Iocaste exhorts her sons to have thoughts (etc.) φίλα towards her own words, *but* that she wants them to be more kindly disposed *towards each other*, that supposition is inappropriate, because Iocaste's exhortation is not at all intended to kindle such reciprocal love in P. and E. On the contrary, she seems to know very well that they will not and cannot agree; all she wants is to get the one at a safe distance from the other (τὸν δ' ἀπίμεν).—So (1) up to and including (5) will not do. Of the 'palmary' supplement the second word was suggested by West to the Lille editors; Maltomini completed it by filling in τέκνα. His argument for τέκνα was that in tragedy one finds four instances of a vocative παῖ (παῖδες) used in combination with (few or no words in between) τέκνον (τέκνα): A. *Cho.* 264-5, 896; S. *Tr.* 61, E. *Hec.* 171 (parodied by Ar. *Nub.* 1165); Tosi added S. *Ph.* 260, E. *Cycl.* 590. In all cases the added vocative gives additional pathos (and in some cases persuasiveness) to what the speaker is going to say.—Meillier (1978b 36), accepting the supplement suggested by West and Maltomini, emphasizes that τέκνα refers to the relation between herself and her two *children*, while παῖδες refers to the relation between the father and his *sons*: it is from him that, according to the fundamental organization of society, property passes to his sons.

219 τᾶιδε γὰρ ... προφα[ίνω: tragedy offers some parallels for this way of introducing a suggestion: A. *Eum.* 45 τῆιδε γὰρ τρανῶς ἐρῶ, S. *El.* 643

τῆιδε γὰρ κἀγὼ φράσω, *Tr.* 554 τῆιδ' ὑμῖν φράσω, E. *Hipp.* 379 τῆιδ' ἀθρητέον τόδε.

ὑμὶν. In Ancher 1977 and in Parsons 1977, υμιν was emended into ὔμ-⟨μ⟩ιν. It is true that in 224 the papyrus has υμμι; but there the Lesbian (and epic) form is useful, for –⏑ is required and the next word has an initial consonant, which would make υμιν into ––. In 219, however, the next word being ἐγών, and ῡμῖν being the normal Doric form, it is better editorial policy to leave the scribe's υμιν. In his 1983 paper Parsons acknowledged this, referring to Gargiulo (58) and Haslam (48 n. 40).

ἐγών: for ἐγών cf. Chantraine *GH* I 264. He considers the -ν 'un archaisme authentique' and compares Sanskrit *ahám*. The -ν is found in Lesbian, and in NW Greek generally; in Homer ἐγών occurs only before initial vowels; ἐγών + consonant is frequent in Alcman: fr. 1(39,85): 29:43(!); here in Stes. it is presumably a Dorism, on a line with γα, πρᾶτος, ποκα κτλ.

τέλος: cf. ad θανάτου τέλος in 213. As 220-224 clearly is an explication (asyndeton explicativum), we have to take τέλος as 'procedure to be followed', 'task to be done', 'course of action to be carried out'.

προφα[ίνω: the supplement is virtually certain. In 203 Ioc. had beseeched Teiresias to stop revealing to her a perspective she was unable to face: μηδέ μοι ... πρόφαινε ἐλπίδας βαρείας. Now the poet makes her use the same verb emphatically ἐγὼν ... προφαίνω.

220-224 See Epilogue, 1 for the background and implications of the arrangement as suggested by Iocaste.

220 τὸν μέν: the papyrus has τομμεν.

ἔχοντα δόμους: a variation of the Homeric formula δώματ' ἔχοντες (ἔχουσαι, ἔχουσι, ἐχόντων) which occurs 29 × in epic poetry (Hom. Hes. Hymn.).

ναίειν π. [⏑⏑–́⏑⏑–́×. Before entering into a discussion of the eight supplements, it is useful to see whether paleography or metre exclude, or make less probable, one or more of them.

Paleography: the traces after the π indicate an ε or ο: here inspection of the papyrus has led Worp and myself to differ from Parsons' results (he noted: π.[:πλ[or πα[ ). Metre: in all other verifiable instances of this colon, str. 3, (213; 234; 241; 276; 283; 297?) one finds a double-short, so it is improbable (although not impossible) that in 220 it would be a longum.

Now for the supplements:

1) πα̣[τρῷα τε ἔργα Ancher
2) πα̣[τρώϊά τ' ἔργα Meillier
3) πα̣[ρ' εὐκτίτωι ἄστει Gargiulo

4) πα̣[ρὰ νάμασι Δίρκας Barrett
5) πα̣[τρίοις ἐνὶ Θήβαις Diggle
6) πε̣[ριχαλλέας ἀμέων Barigazzi
7) πό̣[λιν εὐρυάγυιαν Sisti
8) πό̣[λιν εὐκλέα Κάδμου Gallavotti

The fact that (1), (2), (3), (4) and (5) are incompatible with the traces, disqualifies them from the start. Supplements (1) and (2) are even less probable because of the longum πατρ where ⏑⏑ would be expected. Also I do not understand the τ(ε); and there is an objection from epic phraseology. The action ναίειν normally has a complement in the accusative: δώματα, οἰκία, πόλιν, Τροίην, Θήβην (λ 265), or in the dative (sometimes 'reinforced' by ἐν): αἴθερι, ἐν δώμασι, but one never finds ναίειν ἔργα. In epic diction ἔργα are the object of e.g. τελεῖν, εἰδέναι, ἔχειν, κομίζειν, πένεσθαι, νέμεσθαι, κτλ.; never of ναίειν. Supplement (3) is also less likely within the context of epic diction: one does not live παρὰ ἄστει, but *in* it. In this respect (4) is better: the Δίρκης νάματα, in combination with Ismenos occur in E.*Ba.* 5 as an indication of the site of Thebes; cf. also *Ph.* 102 and *HF* 573. The phrase παρὰ νάμασι Δίρκας almost sounds as if it were an epic formula; it is not one, in fact. If the traces allowed it, I would be inclined to prefer (5): rather than a lyrical paraphrase as in (4) one needs a plain indication of what it is all about: Thebes. And the adjective πατρίοις would be very apt because it is balanced by πατρός in the next line: Iocaste would give each son the comforting reassurance that they get a share of what belonged to their *father*. As it is, only supplements (6), (7) and (8) fit the traces, and of these three (8) seems to be the best: it stresses the continuity of the dynasty, from its founder to the new occupier of the throne.

221 **ἀπίμεν** had not been attested so far; ἴμεν is very common in epic, and not absent in lyric poetry: Alcman 3,8; Pi.*O* 6,63; B. 19,12.

κτεάνη: another new form. The verbal root κτᾱ- had produced two poetic words meaning 'possession', 'property': (i) κτέαρ in Homer, always used in the dative plural κτεάτεσσι(ν), and (ii) κτέανον, mostly in the plural κτέανα, in post-Homeric epic and lyric poetry (once, in Theocr. xxv, 109 κτέανα = 'cattle'). The prose form is of course κτῆμα. Greek prose also has a noun κτῆνος (neuter), plur. κτήνη = 'cattle'. — The form κτεάνη in the Lille papyrus is a morphological hybrid between κτεάνα and κτήνη. In the context its meaning evidently is 'cattle', cf. 241, 243, 272. The semantic relation between 'possessions' and 'cattle' will not come as a surprise to anyone who recognizes the same relation in Latin 'pecus'-'pecunia'; in the etymology capital 〉 cattle; and in the English 'fee' which corresponds to German 'Vieh', Dutch 'vee'. — Gostoli (26) says

"A dative κτεάνεσσιν is attested in an inscription of the 3rd cent. (IG II^2 11120,8) etc."; one might be tempted to think that κτεάνη occurs in a documentary text of the 3rd century BC, but it is in fact, a *verse* inscription (an epitaph in hexameters and pentameters, oddly arranged), attributed by Kaibel to the 4th-5th century AD. This κτεάνεσσιν is more probably an 'error' of an incompetent poet than a pointed reference to a poem of 1000 years earlier. — About the importance of 'cattle' in the settlement proposed by Iocaste cf. Epilogue, 1.

222 σύμπαντα insists on the fairness of this deal: he shall have *all* the gold there is, nothing is to be withheld.

[πατρός must be the correct supplement, also in view of the fact that Stesichorus' style distinguishes itself by alliteration: in this poem

the μ in μή ... μερίμνας μηδέ μοι 201-2
the φ/π/β in -οπίσω πρόφαινε ἐλπίδας βαρείας 202-3
the θ/τ in θεοὶ θέσαν ἀθάνατοι κατ' 205
the θ/τ in θανάτου τέλος στυγεροῖο γένοιτο 213
the φ/π in παίδες ... φίλα .. πίθεσθε 218
the τ in Τειρεσίας τεράσπολος .. ἐπίθοντο 234
the κ in περικαλλέα κούραν 276
the δ in δωσοῦντι δᾶμος 278
the π in πόλει ... πᾶσαι 285
the κ in καλὰ Κορίνθου 302

Gallavotti (1977a) notes not without national pride that "il procedimento allitterante è di gusto italico, popolaresco o cultuale, ed è raro nella poesia greca" (4).

223 κλαροπαληδόν, an *addendum lexicis*, cf. Schwyzer I 626. There are (i) simple pseudo-participial forms with an adverbial function, first of all deverbatives like σχεδόν, ῥυδόν (also in -δην; σύδην, βάδην); then (ii) denominative forms with the same adverbial function, as ἀγεληδόν, σφαιρηδόν; finally (but only rarely) one finds (iii) composite forms as βουστροφηδόν, and this κλαροπαληδόν. They are probably derived from compound verbs *βουστροφέω and *κλαροπαλέω (cf. the adjective κληροπαλεῖς in *Hy.Herm.* 129).

Casting lots is a way of consulting the will of the gods: ὁ νείμας κλῆρος ὢν θεός (Pl. *Lg.* 741b). In the *Iliad* the Achaeans pray to Zeus ἢ Αἴαντα λαχεῖν ἢ Τυδέος υἱόν κτλ. (H 179): Ajax' lot falls out of the helmet and he has to fight Hector. In the *Odyssey* Eurylochus or Odysseus will have to go out to reconnoitre: Eurylochus' lot falls out, and he has to face Circe's music (κ 206). Evidently it was an agreed technique by which to let the gods designate someone for a dangerous undertaking if on the human level no decision could be reached.

224 **πρᾶτος**: For the Dorism see § 2.

ἕκατι: In 5th century and later poetry this word has almost the same function as the 'postpositions' χάριν and ἕνεκα: 'because of'. In archaic poetry (ο 319, τ 86, υ 42; Alcman fr. 59 a 1, Archil. fr. 193,2) the link with ἑκών is still felt: here ἕκητι (ἕκατι) means 'by the favour/will of (usually a god)'; Aeschylus has a few pregnant cases of this type, e.g. *Cho.* 436. M. Leumann (*Hom. Wörter* 251-8) gives an explanation for the surprising formation of this word. He takes θεῶν ἀέκητι = 'against the will of the gods' as the older form, created by the aoidoi as an alternative for the heavy θεῶν ἀεκόντων, by analogy with θεῶν ἰότητι = 'according to the will of the gods'. An alternative explanation would be to fit ἀέκητι into the group of 'negative adverbs' ἀβοατί, ἀσταχτί, ἀμαχητί, ἀμογητί; an originally Lesbian form with withdrawn accent ἀέκητι might, via epic, have become part of general poetic diction. Schwyzer hesitates: I 550 n. 8 and 623.

ἕκατι Μοιρᾶν: This phrase is used by Iocaste with a definite purpose: to neutralize what Teiresias had told her. She had been scared by it, but kept it at arm's length even in her syntax: αἰ ... μόρσιμόν ἐστιν ἐπεκλῶσαν δὲ Μοῖραι. Now she is taking the organization of the future in her own hands, Μοῖραι included. Meillier: "Elle s'en remet au tirage au sort qui est l'expression des Moires. L'opposition au devin est perceptible, mais ne peut faire autrement que s'exprimer dans la reconnaissance du sacré.... L'idéologie religieuse du devin est habilement contestée" (1978b: 36, 39).

225 **δοκέω** as used here, in parenthesi, has no parallel in epic poetry. It is also unusual from the semantic point of view, as δοκέω is here equivalent to οἶμαι (only attested in H 192) and not to φαίνομαι (as normally in Homer).

226 **λυτήριον**: This is the first attested occurrence of the word in Greek (not in epic, nor in archaic lyric; only Pi. *P.* 5,106). Stesichorus' entire phrase seems to be echoed in A. *Eum.* 298 γένοιτο τῶνδ' ἐμοὶ λυτήριος (subj. the goddess Athena) and S. *El.* 1489-90 ὡς ἐμοὶ τόδ' ἂν κακῶν/ μόνον γένοιτο τῶν πάλαι λυτήριον (τόδ' being the killing of Aegisthus by Orestes). Cf. also E. *Alc.* 224, *Ph.* 969.

κακοῦ πότμου: In Homer πότμος is often associated with death/dying in the formula θάνατον/θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν. The word can however mean 'good fortune' as well, and does so frequently in Pindar, no doubt reflecting the bliss his victorious athletes enjoy. Here in Stesichorus κακοῦ πότμου is short hand for "all the evil which according to Teiresias, fate has in store for us".

227 **μάντιος φραδαῖσι θείου**: This phrase raises a syntactical difficulty which is intimately connected with the question what these three words

mean in their context; the whole position of Teiresias is at stake. First the syntactical problem: how about the dative φραδαῖσι? There are two parallels in early epic poetry: in *Hy. Ap.* 99 Eileithyia remains far from Delos Ἥρης φραδμοσύνῃς λευκωλένου; in Hes. *Op.* 245 an entire city is punished Ζηνὸς φραδμοσύνῃσιν Ὀλυμπίου. Note how in both cases the hyperbaton closely resembles that in Stes. 227. The meaning of the phrase is 'because of/ according to the indications given by (Hera/Zeus)': a causal dative. This is confirmed by verse inscriptions (already adduced by Parsons 1977; now most recently edited by P. A. Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca s. viii-v aCn*, Berlin 1983; I use his numbers as well as those of *IG*³). When a person has dedicated a monument or given an offering, one finds in prose inscriptions κατὰ μαντείαν, κατ' ἐπιταγήν, προστάξαντος τοῦ θεοῦ, signalling that the dedicator acted according to a divine command, cf. *S.I.G.*³ III 1153 with note. Now precisely this is indicated in verse inscriptions by μάντεων φρασμοσύναι (a dactylic verse, 243 Hansen = *IG* I³ 773), θεοῦ φραδαῖς (a iambic line, 247 Hansen = *IG* I³ 750), φραδαῖσι νυμφῶν (again a iambic line, 321 Hansen = *IG* I³ 980). In these three contexts τινὸς φραδαῖσ(ι) means 'because of/according to the indications/instructions of'. Cf. also A.*Cho.* 941, *Eum.* 245 and E.*Ph.* 667.

But now the second problem arises. Can one reasonably assume that the course of action to be undertaken (τέλος 219) and the solution to be tried (λυτήριον 226), which have so emphatically been brought forward by Iocaste as *her* initiative (ἐγὼν προφαίνω 219, δοκέω 225), somehow run along the lines indicated by Teiresias? Tosi (139) thinks one cannot; he points out that in tragedy Teiresias invariably has the function of "il portavoce di un ineluttabile destino, cui il protagonista cerca vanamente di ribellarsi, e non come il complice del tentativo di sfuggire al fato" (he refers to S.*OT* 316-442, *Ant.* 988-1114; Eur. *Ph.* 834-960). If one elaborates this hypothesis, viz. that Teiresias has indicated for the future a road leading to a catastrophe, one way or another and that Iocaste now wants to escape along a *completely different* track, one runs into two difficulties: (a) how to interpret 227, and also (b) how to interpret σὺν δ' ἅμα Τειρεσίας in 234. Attempts to solve both difficulties are not convincing. Ad (a): μάντιος φραδαῖσι θείου explains κακοῦ: "fate has bad things in store for us because the μάντις told us so"; but I wonder whether Greek usage admits a causal dative so exclusively attached to an adjective; and there is also a shade of meaning in φράζω/φραδή which opposes itself, for φράζειν is not just a synonym of λέγειν, φάναι ('to tell', 'to inform') but has a pragmatic-deictic aspect 'to show', 'to show how to', 'to instruct' (cf. Α 527; λ 549; Pi.*I.* 6,68). Ad (b): one may give a minimal interpretation: "Teiresias joins Iocaste in her effort to prevent the sons from fighting,

although he is aware that she is throwing his prophecies to the winds"; but the very brevity and simplicity of the phrase σὺν δ' ἅμα do not admit this nuance: he is in full agreement with what she has said in 218-231.

Therefore, I think another solution must be sought. Instead of looking with Tosi to the Teiresias of tragedy, one should look to the Teiresias of the *Odyssey* and observe how he speaks to Odysseus there (λ 100-137). He foretells Odysseus that he will come home with his companions *if* they keep their hands off Helios' cattle. *If* they fail to do so, companions and ship will perish (for a conditional oracle cf. also Hdt. I 53,3). Is it possible that Teiresias' prophecy to Iocaste is 'conditional' as well? Bollack (54) had considered this possibility, and for once I agree with him. The prophecy might have been: "*If* your sons both insist on reigning over Thebes, catastrophe is bound to ensue, and then it will be either mutual fratricide or the sack of the city". This message might be sufficient motivation for all Iocaste has been saying so far, more especially for the third part (the Allegro vivace, cf. my comment ad 218-224); then, Iocaste is glad to have discovered a solution which is *in line with what Teiresias has said* and which can be made operational by the casting of the lot. An additional advantage of this hypothesis is, that it is now quite understandable that from 253 to 291 Teiresias delivers a second speech with detailed announcements of what awaits Polyneices in Argos: a bride (276), a gift from the people (278 with note). The last stanza of that speech might contain another warning: the throne will have to be the undisputed possession of Eteocles throughout (διαμπερέως 281), however bad someone will feel about it (ἐν στήθεσσιν αἰνῶς, 282). If they fail to keep the terms of the arrangement, they will endanger the entire city (τευξ[ ]ταν πόλει τε πάσαι 285), and everlasting mourning (ἀεὶ ... πένθος, 287) for their mother (ματ[ρί τε, 286). These remains of Teiresias' second speech confirm that he, in his turn, is thinking along the lines of what Iocaste has said. This is, I suppose, as far as one can come in trying to interpret the phrase μάντιος φραδαῖσι θείου: a hypothesis which gives to this expression its normal sense and fits the wider context.

228 αιτενεον: Parsons 1977: "I seem to see τ, not γ". On close inspection of the papyrus we (dr. Worp and I) could clearly see that it *is* a tau, the reading of which is hampered by the circumstance that the horizontal stroke of the tau is interrupted at the left-hand side by a slight abrasion of the top layer of the papyrus. From a methodical point of view it is necessary first (i) to discuss whether αιτενεον κτλ. gives good sense, before (ii) resorting to an emendation to solve the problem.

(i) αιτενεον. If one accepts this reading, one is forced to introduce a corresponding αἴτε elsewhere in the epode. Meillier (1977c, 66) suggests in 230-1 [αἴτ' ἔτι δηρὸν] πέπρωται γενέ[σ]θαι, and translates: "que Zeus ne

sauve que maintenant (νέον) la lignée et la ville du roi Cadmus en reportant pour longtemps le malheur, ou que le malheur soit fixé par le destin pour longtemps encore"; he refers to B 435-36: μηδ' ἔτι δηρὸν ἀμβαλλώμεθα ἔργον. But there the phrase ἔτι δηρόν aptly qualifies ἀμβαλλώμεθα, while in the proposed supplement for Stes. 230 it awkwardly qualifies πέπρωται; already in Meillier's own translation the futility of the supplement is evident, because 'pour longtemps' appears in *both* clauses: they are no real alternatives. The same objection militates against Ancher's [αἴτ' ἀσινῆ δάν]: δάν is semantically equivalent to πολὺν χρόνον. And ἀσινῆ is almost preposterous: Iocaste can hardly be supposed to say: maybe the dynasty is destined "to be/become undamaged"— after the disasters which have struck Laius and Oedipus in her own lifetime! Much better is Slings' (1978b) supplement [αἴτε πάλαι δὴ]... γενέ[θ]λαι; he translates: "whether Zeus will again (νέον) show his love (etc.) or this has been the destination of our family from of old". *Prima facie* no problems remain, and νέον-πάλαι gives a neat polarity (Slings adduces I 527; one could also compare Hdt. IX 26,2); but I have two objections, (a) from style (b) from rhetoric.

(a) Style: in Stesichorus' homerizing style nouns are normally well provided with adjectives, and γενέθλαι should have one.

(b) Rhetorically it is weak or at least confusing if Iocaste were to end her passionate plea with this 'whether ... or'.

A paraphrase will bring this out: "My dear sons, please obey, for I am convinced that my solution of the problem will work: *only this way* we can, even according to Teiresias' own instructions, prevent evil fate coming upon us, whether Zeus will again love Cadmus' offspring or this has been the fate of the family all along". Does 'again' refer to Cadmus' marriage? for after that the Theban dynasty has not been the object of Zeus' love! And what precisely is the subject of πέπρωται ("this" in my paraphrase) supposed to be? If it is χαχότας, then Iocaste's optimism is without any chance of success, and she would crush her own plan by fatalism. If it is something like 'salvation' (see the supplements for the end of this line 228), then the syntax is very loose. Whatever subject one chooses for πέπρωται I cannot let myself be persuaded (perhaps others can?) that a 'whether-or' is the final chord of Iocaste's music.

(ii) αἴ γε νέον. This should now be considered an emendation. A discussion has to begin with the point raised and answered by Haslam (1978, 53 n. 52): "γα, not γε, is written at 207; but orthographical consistency is not to be expected, and probably not to be imposed either". Alternatively, one can go one step further and emend into αἴ γα (so Luppe). For the use of εἴ γε compare Denniston, 142: the limitative particle puts the conditional clause more 'on edge': "if, that, is, etc."

The advantages of this reading will easily be perceived. It is as an adjective to γένος that νέον now can make full sense: "Cadmus' νέον γένος will be Eteocles and Polyneices; perhaps Zeus will save *them*, even if he failed to save the older members of the line, Oedipus and Laius" (Haslam). Tosi, without having seen Haslam's paper, preferred the same syntax: "νέον—piuttosto che avverbiale—dovrà essere considerato attributo di γένος" (140); he refers to S.*OT* 1 Κάδμου τοῦ πάλαι νέα τροφή. Γένος as 'generation' is well known from e.g. γ 245 and Hes.*Op.* 109; 127; 143; 156; 176; νέον γένος 'a new, fresh generation' occurs in Pi. frg. 52 K 21. If one combines this reading (as Haslam has done) with Lloyd-Jones' supplements of 230-231 [ἁ βασιλεία] πέπρωται γενέ[θ]λαι, the rhetorical tenor of the whole sentence becomes clear and convincing: Iocaste realizes that κακότας is bound to come, finally and crushingly, upon this royal family; all she hopes is: après nous ... An interesting parallel is A.*Ag.* 1568-1573 (here I follow a hint given by R. Führer): chorus and Clytaemnestra are agreed that the Pleisthenid family is doomed; all the queen hopes, and she would like to make a covenant with the daemon for that purpose, is that he will avert final catastrophe (consisting in murders within the family) from this house to another family. The difference between the two cases is that Clytaemnestra hopes for ἀποτροπή (compare E. Fraenkel ad A.*Ag.* 1573) and Iocaste hopes for ἀναβολή.

About the emendation αἴ γ' ἐτεόν one need not be long: although it would seem to be acceptable in Stesichorus' style (εἰ ἐτεόν γε occurs in Θ 423, M 217), it would result in making Zeus willingness-to-save far too general (the specification νέον disappears).

ἄστυ [⏑–×. Scholars have made various suggestions:

(1) [τινάσσει Gallavotti
(2) [ῥύοιτο Meillier
(3) [φυλάξει Barigazzi
(4) [σαώσει Barrett, Lloyd-Jones
(5) [φιλήσει Slings

(1) can be understood only in relation to what Gallavotti wants to do with the rest of the sentence: reading αἴτε νέον in 228, he supplements [αἴτε καὶ ἄλλως] in 230 and interprets ἀμβάλλων as 'accumulando'; and he takes *both* αἴτε clauses as an explanation of the κακὸς πότμος of 226. There are, however, no convincing parallels for this meaning of ἀναβάλλω; and it is nothing less than absurd that Iocaste would wind up her speech by weighing these two alternatives, both desperately bad. Supplements (2), (3), (4) and (5) all give a verb with a meaning which fits the context.—Supplement (2) gives the entire sentence the same mood: optative throughout; (3), (4) and (5) give the 'distance' of the indicative

(see the comment ad 212). In favour of σαόω is the parallel P 144 φράζεο νῦν ὅκως κε πόλιν καὶ ἄστυ σαώσῃς; φυλάσσω is plausible, too, because (as Tosi points out) gods are often said or asked to φυλάσσειν πόλιν: Theogn. 781; A. *Th.* 137; B. 13,186; Timoth. 161 (*PMG* 791).—I would prefer the optative because of ἂν ... γένοιτο in the main sentence.

229 Κάδμου ἄνακτος: Nöthiger 43-44 observed that Stes. has 14 genitives in -ου and only one certain case of -οιο (185 *PMG*). So it is not surprising to find Κάδμου here; but the Lille papyrus has two cases of -οι' ἄνακτος, 275 and 280. In Homer -οιο ἄνακτος is the rule, and later poets who wanted to retain epic flavour in a iambo-trochaeic line adapted it to -οι' ἄνακτος, so (probably) Archilochus in fr. 120,1 (West): Διωνύσοι' ἄνακτος. In the fragments of Ibycus we find 5 × -οιο against 4 × -ου.

230 ἀμβάλλων: We have already seen that this is what Iocaste is hoping for: postponement. Postponement of evil was earnestly presented as a form of divine favour by nobody less than the Pythia of Delphia (Hdt. I 91,3): to Croesus' reproaches she replied that the god had very much preferred to delay the fall of Sardes until the next generation, but the Moirai had been adamant; all he (Apollo) had been able to obtain for his protégé was a small delay: τρία γὰρ ἔτεα ἐπανεβάλετο τὴν Σαρδίων ἅλωσιν.—Epic parallels for this use of ἀναβάλλω (-ομαι) are B 436, τ 584, Hes. *Op.* 410, 412, 413. For Gallavotti's eccentric interpretation of this verb see my comment ad 228 ἄστυ [....

πολὺν χρόνον: There are 12 occurrences of this phrase in Homer, all in the same *sedes* as here, before the bucolic diaeresis.

χρόνον [–⏑⏑–×: Several supplements have already been discussed in connexion with the problem of αἴτε or αἴ γε (γα) 228. If the placing of P.Lille 111c is correct, then the trace which occurs at the left hand side of its first line and which is most probably a sigma gives us the final letter of line 230. I suggest [ἃ περὶ Θήβα]ς/ πέπρωται γεν[έ]σθαι. I disagree with what Parsons reads in 231; he prints γεν.[.]..ι and excludes γενέσθαι. As I see it, the lacuna comes immediately after the ny; after the lacuna the first trace is compatible with sigma, the second with theta.

231 πέπρωται: This indicative and its participle form πεπρωμένος (from the stem παρ-, aor. πορεῖν to give, to provide with something) belong to the same semantic field as αἶσα, μοῖρα, μόρος. The Greeks evidently had a keen perception of the fact that one's life depends on 'what has been given, shared out to one'. Of the seven occurrences of πέπρωται/πεπρωμένος in Homer and Hesiod six carry a contextual connotation of '*evil* destination', 'death'; the only case in which it is used neutrally (O 209) occurs in a discussion between gods: Poseidon describes his own position in relation to Zeus as ἰσόμορον καὶ ὁμῇ πεπρωμένον αἴσῃ (in the preceding passage he had mentioned the division

of the cosmos among the three sons of Kronos). In this Stesichorean instance πέπρωται carries a negative connotation, at least if the supplement [ἅ κτλ. is correct.

232 ὣς φατο: The well-known opening dactyl of so many Homeric hexameters. Whenever a speech of a character X is followed by an answer from a character Y, this answer is introduced by τὸν/τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος κτλ. or τὸν/τήν δ' αὖτε προσέειπεν. If, however, there is no answer, the narrator continues his story by ὣς φατο. Cf. (just to give the examples in one book) A 33; 43; 188; 345; 357; 457; 511; 568; 595.

δῖα γυνά. Homer and Hesiod use δῖα θεάων (± 40 ×) and δῖα γυναίκων (12 ×); the adjective conveys only a general notion of excellence. The poet did not indicate her identity more precisely here; for that problem see § 6: the Myth.

μύθοις ἀγανοῖς ἐνέποισα: She is trying to get her message across by using kind words. The *Iliad* has four instances of σοῖς (δ') ἀγανοῖς ἐπέεσιν (B 164; 180; 189 and Ω 772); the *Odyssey* has μύθοις ἀγανοῖσι (ο 53). The three instances in *Iliad* B are used in a comparable situation in so far as 'kind words' from Odysseus must keep the Achaean kings from doing what they actually do (dragging the ships down to the sea in order to go home).

Tosi (142) aptly adduces another poetic scene: Pi. *I.* 8,30-50. There Zeus and Poseidon are quarreling about who shall marry Thesis; Themis reveals an *oracle* about Thesis' son who will be φέρτερος πατρός, and she proposes *a way out* (Peleus shall marry Thetis); the narrative continues ὣς φάτο Κρονίδαις ἐννέποισα θεά (49), and the gods *obey*. The scene is remarkably similar.

233 νείκεος: This word had been used in 188 (by Teiresias or Iocaste, see my remark on 176-200); it occupies a central place (206) in Iocaste's argument against Teiresias.

π̣[αύο]ισα: As Parsons pointed out, above the trace of the π (it could be a iota or gamma as well) there is another bit of ink ("perhaps the lower left arc of a circle"). Is this a suprascript variant ε[ργο] written above π̣[αυο]ισα (so Barrett), or is ἔ[ργο]ισα a corrected itacism (so Parsons)? There is no way of knowing for certain what the scribe wrote. But the parallels adduced by Tosi (142) make it very probable that παύοισα was what Stesichorus wrote: ω 543 παῦε δὲ νεῖκος, Hes. *Th.* 87 μέγα νεῖκος ... κατέπαυσεν (and also Pi. *I.* 8,35; A. *Th.* 936).

234 σὺν δ' ἅμα Τειρεσίας: This can only mean that Tiresias is backing Iocaste's words. For the relation of this phrase to μάντιος φραδαῖσι θείου 227 see my comm. ad locum.

τ[......]λος: Barrett's τερασπόλος (on the analogy of τερασκόπος and ὀνειροπόλος), although a word not attested so far, is highly probable. One

could compare also the existing μαντιπόλος. Pi. *P.* 4,201 has τερασκόπος. It would be an etymological pun, since the name Τειρεσίας is itself derived from τέρας with metrical lengthening in the first syllable.

οἱ δ̣[ε]π̣ί̣θο̣[ντο. The *Iliad* has 7, the *Odyssey* 6 instances of the line ὣς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα τοῦ μαλὰ μὲν κλύον ἠδὲ πίθοντο, neither aorist form carrying the augment. The *Odyssey* has an adaptation of this formula to the situation in Odysseus' Apologoi: ὣς ἐφάμην· οἱ δ' ὦκα ἐμοῖς ἐπέεσσι πίθοντο (3 ×). In view of these cases I think it is more probable, although of course not certain, that Stesichorus, too, used the unaugmented form, and I have divided accordingly. Barrett's οἱ δ'[ἀ]π̣ί̣θ̣η̣[σαν can be excluded because of the further development of the narrative: Polyneices *does* leave Thebes after the casting of the lot.

As for a tentative reconstruction and interpretation of lines 235-303, I refer to Parsons 1977, 25-36. There is little one can add to his precise and ingenious annotation. I confine myself to a few supplementary notes, mainly of palaeographical nature.

235 Parsons notes here: "α.[probably upsilon, but nu not excluded. If a connective, αὐ[τάρ or αὐ[τίκα?" Autopsy of the papyrus convinced Worp and me that only ἀν̣[corresponds to the traces; an upsilon can be excluded. This reading of the traces also disqualifies Page's αἶ[ψα.

236 Parsons: "].ηβαν: the trace suggests the right-hand side of an oval: Θήβαν or Θηβᾶν very likely." The papyrus shows also a trace of a horizontal through that oval. So Θ̣ηβαν, almost certainly.

238 Parsons' και.[is not correct; the papyrus has κατ.[.

243 If West's εὐεθ]είρας is correct, one ought to keep in mind that Archilochus fr. 323 shows χρυσοέθειρ to be a noun of the third declension.

253ff. Parsons, in his comment on 246ff., sketches two possible arrangements of 253-290: either two speeches, by Polyneices and Teiresias, or just one speech, by Teiresias. The new evidence of P. Lille 111c (for Ancher 1978 has proved that this fragment has the line-beginnings of 265-269) makes it certain that 253-290 is one speech. The words (θεοὶ δομεν[, τὰ μ]έν, τὰ δ[έ] belong to a discourse of someone who gives a theological explanation that the gods give many things to men of which some items (...) and other items (...). Within the context of this narrative, it must be Teiresias helping Iocaste by defending the solution proposed by her.

255 Parsons notes: "]. .ε, perhaps]α̣δ̣ε, hardly]ατε or]ατο" and suggests πέφρ]αδε βουλάν. Inspection of the papyrus leads to the reading].ατεβουλαν. Perhaps φιλ]τ̣ατε?

260 Although Parsons was uneasy about it, the papyrus *does* have]επολλα̣γαρ̣υμ̣ι̣ν. This fits very well in the speech as a whole. Teiresias

begins by addressing one of the two brothers, φιλ]τ̣ατε, presumably the one who has, after the drawing of the lot, demurred against the outcome. Then Teiresias proceeds to speak to Eteocles and Polyneices together: "for there are many things for you (ὑμίν)" and goes on for a while discussing the situation in general terms (see my note ad 253ff.), the same word πολλά recurs in 265 and 269; and there is a second plural θέντες in 270.

268 Parsons records Barrett's suggestion that]ξ̣αιc may be the ending of an aorist participle of a verb on -ζειν. This is not very likely because 257 shows an aorist participle without that aeolic diphthong: πιθήσας.

281 As for the interpretation of διαμπερέως Gallavotti 8 had already pointed to Hesychius' gloss σαφῶς, τελείως.

293 Page's restoration of this line has much to commend it; there is the famous scene of Hippolytus going into exile and followed by his friends and servants E.*Hipp.* 1187ff.; 1195ff.

Epilogue: 1. The Myth

The question to be discussed under this heading is: Is it possible to delineate with any precision the configuration given by Stesichorus to this myth against the background of existing versions? Perhaps the only statement one can make with full certainty is that we do have here a version of the traditional story. The names of Cadmus (229), Teiresias (234), Eteocles (281), Polyneices (283, 293), Adrastus (275) are spread out over the text and prove, beyond any possible doubt, that this *is* the story we know from so many other versions. Oddly enough the names of the parents of Eteocles and Polyneices are nowhere spelled out in the fragment we have. For the father that is of no importance; he can only be Oedipus. But there is a problem concerning the name and identity of the mother. And the solution to this problem—if there is one—can be approached by giving the different testimonia and seeing if and how they can fit together.

1) There is the short but compact passage λ 271-280. Several features draw attention:

— the outcome of the parricide and incest ἄφαρ, 'at once' after the marriage (cf. R. Führer in *Lex. frühgr. epos* s.v.); and hence:
— nothing at all about *any* children;
— Epicaste's suicide, so she dies forthwith;
— Oedipus' continued reign over Thebes: ἐν Θήβῃ ... ἤνασσε;
— unspecified trouble for Oedipus and Thebes in the time after (θεῶν ὀλοὰς διὰ βουλὰς ... ἄλγεα πολλά).

2) In Hesiod's *Erga*, in the context of the description of the heroic age, mention is made of a war fought around seven-gated Thebes, Cadmus' land, μήλων ἕνεκ' Οἰδιπόδαο (163). West (ad locum) makes this refer to the war of the Seven against Thebes but C. Robert (113-114) is right in saying that nothing in Hesiod's text compels us to interpret it in that way. *Prima facie* it refers to a war with a neighbouring people (the Minyans?) who had made a raid on Oedipus' cattle; the kind of war reported by Nestor (Λ 670-760): a battle between the Pylians and the Epeans ἀμφὶ βοηλασίῃ (Λ 672). In fact there is a testimony about a war between Thebans and Minyans, in the course of which two of Oedipus' sons were killed: Pherecydes, FGH 3 F 95. And a phrase in Ψ 679 implies that even Oedipus himself was killed in (this?) battle: δεδουπότος Οἰδιπόδαο. In a scholion *ad locum* Aristarchus duly reprehends the 'glossographers' who noted δεδουπότος = τεθνηκότος, and his argument is well worth quoting in full: νοητέον ὅτι ἤτοι ἐν πολέμωι τετελεύτηκεν, ψοφοῦσι γὰρ οἱ πίπτοντες · ' δούπησεν δὲ πεσών'.

3) In *Iliad* Δ, in connection with Diomedes, details are given which presuppose the expedition, if not of the 'Seven', at least of Polyneices and Diomedes' father Tydeus against Thebes (Δ 377-378) at a time when Eteocles was in power there (Δ 386).

4) Of the epic *Oidipodia* only two hexameters are transmitted (fr. 2), telling that Creon's son Haemon was taken as a victim by the Sphinx; and nothing else. But Pausanias IX 5,11 relates that in the *Oidipodia* Oedipus had four children with Euryganeia, daughter of Hyperphas. Nothing in Pausanias' text indicates that she was Oedipus' *second* wife; although an argument *ex silentio* is never conclusive, Robert (110) is convinced that this epic poet could never have gone so far as to present Oedipus as happily marrying a second time after the terrible experience of his marriage with his mother. If Robert is right, then Euryganeia is just another name for his mother, and the (fifth cent. B.C.) mythographer Pherecydes, in the fragment referred to above, has combined the two traditions. I now quote him in full: Οἰδίποδι Κρέων δίδωσι τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα Λαίου, μητέρα δ' αὐτοῦ Ἰοκάστην, ἐξ ἧς γίνονται αὐτῷ Φράστωρ και Λαόνυτος, οἵ θνήσκουσιν ὑπὸ Μινυῶν καὶ Ἐργίνου. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐνιαυτὸς παρῆλθε, γαμεῖ ὁ Οἰδίπους Εὐρυγάνειαν τῆς Περίφαντος, ἐξ ἧς γίνονται αὐτῷ Ἀντιγόνη καὶ Ἰσμήνη, (...) υἱοὶ δὲ αὐτῷ ἐξ αὐτῆς Ἐτεοκλῆς καὶ Πολυνείκης (3 F 95). The essence of this is repeated by a later mythographer, Peisander on authority of someome else (φασὶ δέ, probably Pherecydes): FGH 16 F 10,8.

5) The epic poem called *Thebais* is mainly concerned with the expedition of the Seven from Argos (cf. the preserved opening verse = fr. 1); as far as we can tell from the fragments the poet only went into the im-

mediate causes of this war: Oedipus' curse(s) on his sons (fr. 2 and 3). Nothing about Epicaste (Iocaste) or Euryganeia here.

We can now survey the 'ground', a trite metaphor which is apt in so far as one seems to work on a large area covered with fragments of architecture and sculpture; one only knows that there *were* several different buildings, but the composition and ornamentation of each individual building can only be guessed at. I repeat that the full survey can be found in Robert's monograph; I only pick out what serves the purpose of the present inquiry. And I make the following hypothesis:

— In a tradition represented by (1), Oedipus' incestuous marriage (with *Epi*caste) remained childless; his own fate was to survive her, to suffer much, and Thebes with him. The incest was itself 'the end', and could not lead to any offspring.

— In another tradition, represented by (2), there were at least two children from the incestuous marriage. Oedipus was killed with his sons Phrastor and Laonytos in a battle against the Minyans and that was the end of the dynasty. The mother may have been called Euryganeia for all we know.

— In a third, represented by (3), (4) and (5), there were four children born out of the incestuous marriage; they had the well-known names Eteocles, Polyneices, Antigone, Ismene; Euryganeia was their mother. When Oedipus had to abdicate and disappear after his parricide + incest, his sons quarreled about the succession, Polyneices left Thebes, and the rest of the story was as we all know it: alliance with Argos, expedition against Thebes, mutual fratricide. It is obvious that Stesichorus' poem moves within the frame of reference of the third tradition. But there can be no certainty about the name he had selected for the queen, δῖα γυνά as she is called in 232; for the sake of convenience I have called her Iocaste in my commentary because that is the name under which she is best known.

It must also remain an open question whether or not Stesichorus was the first to organize an arbitration-scene in which the queen tries to prevent her sons from anything fatal as a result of a prophecy uttered by Teiresias. In itself it is far from improbable that Stesichorus introduced new features into the 'material' he took from his epic predecessors. Ancient authorities emphasize his creativity in finding new details and giving new turns to a narrative etc. Examples: Athena springing out of Zeus' head in full armour (*PMG* 233); Helen not arriving in Troy at all, but remaining in Egypt (*PMG* 192-193 with R. Kannicht, *Euripides Helena*, Heidelberg 1969, I 26-41); Typhoeus as son not of Gaia but of Hera herself (*PMG* 239); Heracles' outfit: lion's skin, club and arrows (*PMG* 229); the lock of hair as a means for Electra to recognize Orestes

(*P.Oxy.* 2506, 26ii 11-13 = *PMG* 217). An anonymous literary critic of ± 100 A.D. summarizes Stesichorus' creativity as follows: ἐκαινοποίησε τὰς ἱστορίας (*P.Oxy.* 2506, 26 i 17 = *PMG* 193). So it is *a priori* not at all improbable that in this matter, too, Stesichorus went his own way.

It would be interesting to know if the actual solution to the conflict which Iocaste suggests in the Lille papyrus is also an original invention by the poet. If so, the invention is certainly in line with prevailing tendencies in archaic Greece! The identity of a γένος was bound to the continuous cultivation of one and the same κλῆρος; it was normally forbidden to sell this κλῆρος and one certainly preferred not to split it up over several heirs. In such cases different kinds of solutions could be tried. Hesiod's *Erga* is proof of the reality of the problem: the ideal for a farmer is just *one* son, for then the family property (οἶκος) can be kept together and even increase (376-7). If there are two sons, there is ἔρις and νεῖκος (27-39); given the facts that (i) Hesiod has already given to Perses his share of the κλῆρος (37) and that (ii) Perses has been picking much else besides, Hesiod asks him to keep quiet and not to bribe the βασιλῆες in order to get a favourable verdict. Cf. E. Will 'Aux origines du régime foncier grec', REA 59 (1957) 12-24.

There is one particular document which shows a precise parallel to what Iocaste suggested: when the people of Thera (± 630 B.C.) sent away a number of citizens in order to colonize a particular spot on the North-African coast, later to be called Cyrene, it was decided that in cases where a family had more than one male heir, one of them *chosen by the lot* had to leave the country and join the ἀποικία: Θηραίοισι δὲ ἕαδε ἀδελφεὸν ἀπ' ἀδελφεοῦ πέμπειν πάλῳ λαχόντα (Hdt. IV, 153). The sacred element represented by the lot (cf. ὁ νείμας κλῆρος ὢν θεός, Pl.*Lg.* 741b) guaranteed the indisputability of the choice. This corresponds exactly to κλαροπαληδὸν ἕκατι Μοιρᾶν in Stesichorus. Herodotus I 94 contains another story about shortage of land and food, and a decision that one part of the population, chosen by lot, has to emigrate. But this story seems rather to belong to legend (φασι): it is about the emigrations of Lydians to Italy, under the leadership of the king's son Tursenos. In Strabo V 2,2 the same story is told: ἐπὶ γὰρ λιμοῦ καὶ ἀφορίας ὁ Ἄτυς, εἷς τῶν ἀπογόνων Ἡρακλέους καὶ Ὀμφάλης, δυεῖν παιδῶν ὄντων, κλήρῳ Λυδὸν μὲν κατέσχε, τῷ δὲ Τυρρηνῷ τὸν πλείω συστήσας λαὸν ἐξέστειλεν.—There are two more mythical cases of a disputed heritage: Pi. *P.*4,141-155 and B. 11,64-76. In the first case Aeson's throne and wealth were usurped by his half-brother Pelias. Aeson's son Jason comes to Pelias, and in order to make a peaceful settlement possible (cf. 141-148, 155) he proposes that he himself, being Aeson's son, will inherit the throne and royal power (σκῆπτρον μόναρχον καὶ θρόνος); Jason is willing to leave the wealth to

Pelias: μῆλά τε γάρ τοι ἐγὼ καὶ βῶν ἀγέλας ἀφίημι κτλ. This is very much like Iocaste's proposal. In the Bacchylides passage a conflict has broken out between the twin sons of Abas, king of Argos, called Proetus and Acrisius: νεῖκος γὰρ ... ἀνέπαλτο κασιγνητοῖς (64-65), much to the damage and annoyance of the population: λαοὺς διχοστασίαις ἤρειπον (67-68). Here it is not one individual (as Iocaste in Stes.' poem, Jason in Pindar's) who takes the initiative; the population as a whole implores the younger of the two, Proetus, to leave Argos and to found a new city, Tiryns: λίσσοντο ... Τίρυνθα τὸν ὁπλότερον κτίζειν, πρὶν ἐς ἀργαλέαν πεσεῖν ἀνάγκαν (69-72). Ζεύς τ' ἔθελεν Κρονίδας τιμῶν Δαναοῦ γενεὰν ... παῦσαι στυγερῶν ἀχέων. There is no casting of the lot here, but other similarities strike the observer: if one of the two leaves, the worst will be averted; and in this case Zeus favoured the solution, a happy 'circumstance' which Iocaste, too, is explicitly hoping for (228-231); but, as we know, in vain.

The result of this is that we have one historical (Herodotus) and three mythical (Herodotus, Pindar, Bacchylides) parallels for what Stesichorus makes Iocaste do. Both lyric poets belong, of course, to the fifth century B.C., but the kind of solution occcurring in their narratives will have been part of the tradition before them, and thus poetically available in the period in which Stesichorus composed his poem, roughly one century earlier. A last remark can be made: the Apollinian (Delphic?) element, very much in evidence in Stesichorus, is conspicuously lacking in the other narratives (although in other respects Apollo's part in the colonization of Cyrene has been very important).

2. *The effect of Stesichorus' poem on later poets*

I shall confine myself to discussing the effect of Stesichorus' reconciliation-scene on tragedy, Greek and Roman. Under this heading three tragedies demand attention: Aeschylus' *Septem*, Euripides' *Phoenissae*, Seneca's *Phoenissae*.

a) Aeschylus' *Septem*. There is only one aspect of the action of this play which may be connected with an element of the Stesichorean scene. In the text of the *Septem* we find as a central theme, especially in the 'sieben Redepaare' (369-676) that the aggressors stand to the Theban heroes as the Giants to the Olympian deities. Zeus and Justice are on the side of Thebes, and therefore the Thebans will be the victors. Eteocles who embodies the ideal of a responsible and sensible leader of the community, claims that Justice is on his rather than on Polyneices' side (see especially 659-673). Now it is reasonable to suppose that these affirmations find their basis in the fact that Polyneices has violated an agreement; C. Robert (270-272) has elaborated this supposition and takes it that we

have the substance of this agreement in Hellanicus (FGH 4; F 98); Ἑλλανίκος ἱστορεῖ κατὰ συνθήκην τινὰ αὐτὸν (= τὸν Πολυνείκη, JMB) παραχωρῆσαι τὴν βασιλείαν Ἐτεοκλεῖ, λέγων αἵρεσιν αὐτῷ προθεῖναι τὸν Ἐτεοκλέα εἰ βούλοιτο τὴν βασιλείαν ἔχειν ἢ τὸ μέρος τῶν χρημάτων (= explicative gen., JMB) λαβεῖν καὶ ἑτέραν πόλιν οἰκεῖν· τὸν δὲ λαβόντα τὸν χιτῶνα καὶ τὸν ὅρμον Ἁρμονίας ἀναχωρῆσαι εἰς Ἄργος. The terms of this settlement are virtually identical with what we find in Stesichorus' poem. The differences are that in Hellanicus' report (and in Aeschylus' trilogy, if Robert's hypothesis is correct)) it is 1) not Iocaste but Eteocles who takes the initiative for the deal, and that 2) Polyneices leaves Thebes and departs for the Argolis with the family treasures not after casting of the lot but of his own free will.

b) Euripides' *Phoenissae*. Imitation of Stesichorus is here much more evident. In the first place Iocaste is a (if not the) central character of the play, and she is the one who takes the initiative to reconcile her sons. Also the 'fact' that Iocaste lives on even after the revelation of Oedipus' parricide and incest may have been taken by Euripides from Stesichorus (although one must keep in mind that there is no certainty about the identity of the δῖα γυνά, see Epilogue § 1). In the prologue of the *Phoen.* Iocaste explains (to the audience) how her sons, after Oedipus' abdication, have tried to avoid a clash between them: ξυμβάντ' ἔταξαν τὸν νεώτερον πάρος/ φεύγειν ἑκόντα τήνδε Πολυνείκη χθόνα,/ Ἐτεοκλέα δὲ σκῆπτρ' ἔχειν μένοντα γῆς,/ ἐνιαυτὸν ἀλλάσσοντε κτλ. (71-74). Here nobody has intervened to suggest the settlement and its terms; their willingness to make the settlement is directly caused by Oedipus' curse that they be doomed to θηκτῷ σιδήρῳ δῶμα διαλαχεῖν τόδε (68).

In this version it is not Polyneices but Eteocles who breaks the agreement: when it is his turn to leave Thebes for one year, οὐ μεθίσταται θρόνων,/φυγάδα δ' ἀπωθεῖ τῆσδε Πολυνείκη χθονός (75-76). Euripides took from Stesichorus the idea of Iocaste's effort to reconcile her sons but placed the reconciliation scene at a much later point, viz. when Polyneices has arrived with the Argive army and is laying siege to Thebes. A second and more important difference is the way in which, and the arguments with which, Iocaste intervenes: she is no longer the mother who aims at the traditional solution for 'the two sons of the farmer' that the one is to keep the farm/throne and the other is sent away, taking 'cash and cattle' with him as compensation. In Euripides' tragedy Iocaste wants to save the community as a whole; in her efforts to attain that aim she makes herself the mouth-piece of democratic wisdom and experience (528-530: γῆρας, ἐμπειρία). Her exhortation to Eteocles is based on a central concept of 5th century Athenian ideology: τὸ ἴσον as opposed to τὸ πλέον (538-540). She argues that the former is in agreement

with the law and guarantees the safety of the social fabric while the latter is unjust and leads to disruption of the community. They are even presented as deities: Φιλοτιμία..ἄδικος ἡ θεός (531) and κάλλιον Ἰσότητα τιμᾶν (536). That 'equality' does indeed belong to the centre of democratic ideology, is not only self-evident but also explicitly attested, e.g. by Aristotle in his *Politics*; in 1298a10 he says ἰσότητα ζητεῖ ὁ δῆμος (cf. also 1284a19, 1301a25-35) etc. For a further discussion see G. Vlastos, Ἰσονομίη πολιτική, pp. 1-35 in *Isonomia, Studien zur Gleichheitsvorstellung im griechischen Denken*, edd. J. Mau & E. Schmidt, Berlin 1971. And to both sons she pleads that they think of the city in the first place. Eteocles must realize that his effort to keep power at any price will lead to the destruction of Thebes: πότερα τυραννεῖν ἢ πόλιν σῶσαι θέλεις; (560). Polyneices, too, must not forget that his uninhibited urge to become king of Thebes will be disastrous for the very city he wants to possess: ἀσύνετα δ' ἦλθες καὶ σὺ πορθήσων πόλιν (570).

Not only have we here a clear example of how the tragic poets of Athens, from Aeschylus onwards, reshape and refill traditional myth and make it into a vehicle for actual political issues; it has also been this Euripidean actualization of the Stesichorean scene which has made *Ph.* 445-587 so immensely popular in antiquity, see Bremer 1983 (with the testimonia ad 445-587 in D. J. Mastronarde & J. M. Bremer, *The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Phoinissai*, Berkeley 1982, 413-418).

In itself it is not at all surprising that Euripides took a leaf from Stesichorus' book for his *Phoenissae*; on at least three other occasions in the last decade of his life he turned to the Himerean poet for inspiration, viz. for his *Helen* (412), *Orestes* (408) and *Iphigeneia in Aulis* (405). There is an explicit statement by an anonymous literary critic (*P. Oxy.* 2506, fr. 26 ii = *PMG* 217) that Euripides followed Stesichorus in the *Or.* and *I.A.*, illustrated with quotations. About Stesichorus' palinody as a source of inspiration for Euripides' *Helen* see Kannicht (the preface to his edition, I, 1-41 and 48-57).

c) The third and last dramatic text in this sequence is Seneca's *Phoenissae*. It does not seem to be a complete play; the *cantica* are missing. The first part (1-362, which could be called *Oedipus in Cithaerone*) shows Oedipus on the mountain where he had been exposed as a child and where he wants to die (*ut expirem senex ubi debui infans*, 32-33); here a messenger informs him that Polyneices has come from Argos and asks him to prevent this war and fraternal strife. Oedipus refuses ferociously. The second part (363-664, the *Phoenissae* proper, so to speak, for this coincides roughly with the matter dealt with by Euripides in his play) consists of a reconciliation scene which is obviously unfinished. But even in its unfinished state it deserves full attention.

The main similarity between Seneca's and Stesichorus' reconciliation scene is the prevailing pathos of maternal love, of maternal care and anxiety. Compare Stes. 218 with *per decem mensum graves/ uteri labores* (535); compare also Iocaste's firm resolution that she wants to die herself before being witness to the death, by mutual killing, of her sons, in Stes. 211-217, in Seneca 457-8: *media se opponit parens;/ proinde bellum tollite aut belli moram*. Seneca has used the death-wish of the Stesichorean mother for a very striking dramatic effect, for the Senecan Iocaste provokes her sons: if they want to fight each other, they will have to kill their mother first! From Euripides Seneca adopted the theme that it would be madness to destroy the city one wants to rule over: compare Seneca 556-559 *neve quas regere expetis,/ everte Thebas. quis tenet mentem furor?/ petendo patriam perdis? ut fiat tua,/ vis esse nullam?* with E.*Ph* 560-577. Moricca, in the preface to this edition (Paravia-Torino 1946, xxxiv), rightly points out that the Roman poet enriched his theme with several features from the legend about Coriolanus' mother, but it is beyond the scope of the present inquiry to go into details about this. We must, however, indicate with some precision the two aspects of Seneca's version which differ significantly from the Stesichorean scene: (1) the moment, (2) the scope. As for (1), Stesichorus had chosen a moment in the very beginning of the conflict for Iocaste's intervention. Euripides preferred a much later moment: the Seven are already advancing upon Thebes, but before any fighting occurs Polyneices accepts an invitation from Iocaste to come into Thebes all alone (81-87, 430-445). Seneca has placed the moment of Iocaste's attempt at reconciliation even later: the Argive army has laid siege around Thebes and the battle is starting: *saeva nudatis adest/ acies in armis; aera iam bellum cient/ aquilaque pugnam signifer mota vocat* (389-90). And she manages to obtain a 'cease-fire': *victa materna prece/ haesere bella, iamque in alternam necem/ illinc et hinc miscere cupientes manus/ librata dextra tela suspensa tenent* (434-7).

As for (2), in Seneca's text the scope of the conflict and of the attempted solution — which we considered to be still rural-aristocratic in Stesichorus, and urban-democratic in Euripides — widens into the vast dimensions of an empire. No more talk of movable/unmovable property (Stes.), of citizens in a polis (Eur.), but: *regnum, imperium*. Her counsel to Polyneices is that he should go to another part of the world to build an empire of his own: *si regna quaeris nec potest sceptro manus/ vacare saevo, multa quae possunt peti/ in orbe toto quaelibet tellus dabit* (599-601).

This way of considering the conflict is of course what one can expect from Seneca, counsellor of the Roman Emperor. In 55 he had been at the court when Nero killed his half-brother Britannicus; a dramatic situation desrived by Tacitus in terms which could have been taken from a

poem about Eteocles and Polyneices: *antiquam fratrum discordiam et insociabile regnum* (XIII 17). In Seneca's text Polyneices seems to give in. Iocaste had urged upon him that *regna cum scelere omnibus/ sunt exiliis graviora* (624-5). And when he asks, still not completely convinced: *scelerisne et fraudis suae/ poenas nefandus frater ut nullus ferat?*, she answers: *ne metue, poenas et quidem solvet graves:/ regnabit. est haec poena.* Eteocles interrupts this discussion between his mother and his brother; he is not scared by the perspective that imperial power is going to make him isolated from and hated by everyone, nor by the instability of power (*invisa numquam imperia retinentur diu*, says Iocaste 660). He is prepared to sacrifice family and fatherland for power: *imperia pretio quolibet constant bene* (664).

This is the last line of Seneca's text, and a horrifying one it is. We have come a long way from Stesichorus, but even so it is clear how Stesichorus' poem started a development which leads up to, and ends with, Seneca's. The invention of the archaic Greek poet, viz. a micro-economic solution for a domestic problem of inheritance, has—via the transmitter Euripides—inspired a Roman drama enveloping the whole οἰκουμένη.

This poetic αὔξησις could not be carried further. When, about forty years later, Statius approached the same situation in *Thebaid* VII he did not even attempt to write another reconciliation-scene. In his arrangement of the story, Eteocles remains within the city-walls while Iocaste goes out, accompanied by her two daughters (470-490). She advances to the camp of the Seven, calls for Polyneices and invites him to follow her on her way back to Thebes, and to engage in a discussion with Eteocles: *i mecum patriosque deos arsuraque saltem/ tecta vide, fratremque—quid aufers lumina?—fratrem/ adloquere et regnum iam me sub iudice posce* (507-509). Before Polyneices can give in, Tydeus answers her brutally that he does not trust Eteocles, nor even Iocaste (539-559). For a moment the scales of war and peace are in a precarious balance, until Tisiphone intervenes (562 ff.): she causes an incident (a Theban kills one of the Peloponnesian warriors) and the war begins, not to be stopped (603-607). Tydeus chases Iocaste, Antigone and Ismene away with the sarcastic: "*ite age, nunc pacem sperate fidemque*!" (612).—Instead of forcing his hand in an effort to resume, and to improve upon, a scene already done three times with such impressive results, Statius preferred to elaborate a scene which was not presented in the texts of his predecessors, only alluded to by Euripides (*Ph.* 81-83, 273, 449-451).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

G. Ancher-C. Meillier, "Stesichore (?): P. Lille 76abc", *Cahiers de Recherhes de l'Institut de Papyrologie et d'Egyptologie de Lille (CRIPEL)* 4, Lille 1977, 287-351.

G. Ancher, "P. Lille 111 C + P. Lille 76abc (+ 73)", ZPE 30, 1978, 27-35.

J. Bechert, *Die Diathesen von ἰδεῖν und ὁρᾶν bei Homer*, diss. München 1964.

J. Bollack- P. Judet de la Combe- H. Wismann, *La réplique d' Iocaste*, (Cahiers de Philologie 2), Lille 1977.

J. M. Bremer, "Stesichorus", Lampas 13, 1980, 355-371.

——, "The popularity of Euripides' Phoenissae in Late Antiquity", *Actes du Congrès VII FIEC*, Budapest 1983, 281-288.

A. Carlini, "Osservazioni critiche al P. Lille attribuito a Stesichoro", QUCC 25, 1977, 61-69.

G. Comotti, "Muta cum liquida nel nuovo Stesicoro", QUCC 26, 1977, 59-63.

J. Diggle, "Stesichorus P. Lille 76, 220", ZPE 35, 1979, 32.

H. Fraenkel, "ἐφήμερος als Kennwort für die menschliche Natur", in: *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, München 1960, 23-40.

R. Führer, "Muta cum liquida bei Stesichorus", ZPE 28, 1978, 180-186.

C. Gallavotti, "Un poemetto citarodico di Stesicoro", BPEC 25, 1977, 1-30. [1977a]

——, "L'iscrizione arcaica di Sicinio e la metrica Stesicorea", QUCC 25, 1977, 75-86. [1977b]

T. Gargiulo, "Sul nuovo Stesicoro", BPEC 24, 1976, 55-59.

B. Gentili, "Molossus + Bacchius in the new Stesichorus fragment", GRBS 20, 1979, 127-131.

——, "Preistoria e formazione dell'esametro" in: *Poemi epici rapsodici non-omerici e la tradizione orale*, Padova 1981, 75-106.

A. Gostoli, "Some Aspects of the Theban Myth", GRBS 19, 1977, 23-27.

M. Haslam, "Stesichorean Metre", QUCC 17, 1974, 7-57.

——, "Homeric Words and Homeric Metre: two doublets examined (λείβω-εἴβω, γαῖα-αἶα)", Glotta 54, 1976, 201-211.

——, "The Versification of the new Stesichorus", GRBS 19, 1978, 29-57.

J. Krause, *ἄλλοτε ἄλλος: Untersuchungen zum Schicksalswechsel in der griechischen Dichtung bis Euripides*, München 1976.

J. P. Locher, *Untersuchungen zu ἱερός; hauptsächlich bei Homer*, Bern 1963.

A. Lopez Eira, "Esticoro en el marco de la literatura griega arcaica", *Estudios Clásicos* 19, 1975, 1-32.

A. D. Maingon, *Stesichorus and the epic tradition*, diss. Vancouver 1978, cf. DA 39, 1979, 7330 A.

F. Maltomini, "P. Lille 76aII v. 18(43)", QUCC 25, 1977, 69-75.

C. Meillier, cf. Ancher-Meillier [1977a]

——. "P. Lille 76 abc + 73", ZPE 26, 1977, 1-6. [1977b]

——. "Quelques conjectures à Stesichore", ZPE 27, 1977, 65-67. [1977c]

——, "Stesichore P. Lille 76a + 73: quelques conjectures possibles", SCO 28, 1978, 35-47. [1978a]

——, "La succession d'Oedipe", REG 91, 1978, 12-43. [1978b]

M. Nöthiger, *Die Sprache des Stesichorus und Ibykus*, Zürich 1971.

B. M. Palumbo-Stracca, "Osservazioni metriche al nuovo Stesicoro", BPEC 25, 1977, 31-43.

P. J. Parsons, "The Lille 'Stesichorus'", ZPE 26, 1977, 7-36.

——, "Recent Papyrus Finds: Greek Poetry", in: *Actes du VII Congrès FIEC*, II, Budapest 1983, 521-524.

C. Robert, *Oedipus, Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffes im griechischen Altertum*, Berlin 1915 (2 vols).

R. Pretagostini, "Sticometria del P. LIlle 76", QUCC 26, 1977, 53-59.
A. Rijksbaron, *The syntax and semantics of the verb in classical Greek. An Introduction*, Amsterdam 1984.
C. J. Ruijgh, *Etudes sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam 1967.
——, "De ontwikkeling van de lyrische kunsttaal, met name van het literaire dialect van de koorlyriek", Lampas 13, 1980, 416-435.
——, "Le Dorien de Théocrite", Mnem. IV 37, 1984, 56-89.
C. Santini, "Omerismi in Stesicoro", GIF 1, 1970, 71-76.
C. Segal in: P. Easterling & B. Knox, *Greek Literature*, Cambridge 1985, 186-202.
F. Sisti, "Sul nuovo Stesicoro", BPEC 24, 1976, 50-54.
S. R. Slings, [Review of Bollack], Mnem. IV 31, 1978, 430-432. [1978a]
——, "Stesichorus' Thebaid 228-231", ZPE 30, 1978, 37. [1978b]
R. Tosi, "Note al nuovo Stesicoro", MCr. 13-14, 1978-79, 125-143.
M. Treu, "Stesichorus", in: *RE* Suppl. XI 1253.
E. Turner, "Ptolemaic Book-hands and the Lille Stesichorus", Scrittura e Civiltà 4, 1980, 27-35.
G. Vagnone, "Aspetti formulari in Stes. P. Lille 76 abc", QUCC 12, 1982, 35-45.
J. Vürtheim, *Stesichorus. Fragmente und Biographie*, Leiden 1919.
F. M. J. Waanders, *The history of τέλος and τελέω in ancient Greek*, Amsterdam 1983.
M. L. West, "Stesichorus", CQ 21, 1971, 302-314.
——, "Stesichorus at Lille", ZPE 29, 1978, 1-4.
S. West, *The Ptolemaeic Papyri of Homer*, Köln/Opladen 1967.

INDEX LOCORUM

Alcaeus fr. (Voigt)
135 96
306Ah 97-8
350 15-6

Anacreon fr. (PMG)
408 47

Anthologia Palatina
V 55,2 45
V 55,7 49
V 107, 1-2 9
V 124, 1-2 37
V 235 15-6
XI 374, 7-8 64

Archilochus fr. (West)
13, 3-4 19
31 50
38 51
66 68
96,5 13-4
131 142
196 51
205 68-9
224 52
242 41
247 69
252 69
295 9

Aristophanes
Aves 676-684 15-6

Bacchylides
10, 51 32
11, 64-76 167

Callimachus
Hymni 6,66 sqq. 86
fr. 195, 1-2 (Pf.) 84

Critias fr. (D.-K.)
44 9

Dioscorides Epigrammata (G.-P.)
V 2 45
V 7 49

Euripides
Alcestis 362 22
Hippolytus 9 11

Hedylus (G.-P.)
X, 9 88

Hellanicus (FGH)
4F98 169

Herodotus
IV 153 167

Hesiod
Theog. 910 66

Hipponax fr. (West)
103 (= 106 Deg.) 82
119 (= 120 Deg.) 33
153 (= 146 Deg.) 88

Homer
Od. γ 296 16
Od. π 106-11 146
Od. ρ 486 12
Od. σ 136-7 142

Horace
Carm. IV 13, 8-10 67
Ep. 8, 3-4 64-5

Pherecydes (FGH)
3F95 165

Philodemus Epigrammata (G.-P.)
V, 1-2 9
X, 1-2 37

Pindar
Pyth. IV, 141-55 167

Sappho fr. (Voigt)
48 15-6
94,1 21
137,1 86

Semonides fr.
22 67

Sophocles
Antigone 795-6 66

Strabo
V, 2, 2 167

Theocritus
Id. 7, 120-1 41
Id. 12 15-6
Id. 18, 37 66
Id. 29, 5-6 21

Theognis
288 8
455 8, 14
511-22 15-6
529-30 9

INDEX VERBORUM

αἶα 138-9
ἀλιτήμερος 44
ἀλλοῖος 141
ἀνάγκη 107
ἀνολβίη 8
γαῖα 138-9
γαστρίη 76, 87
δειλός 8
δοκέω 8, 33
ἕκατι 156
ἐλπίς 137
ἐπήλυσις 49
ἐπιστρέφομαι 12
ἐρωδιός 79, 89
εὐρώεις 36
εὔφρων 7
ἐφέπω 115-6
ἐφίεμαι 43
ἐφίσταμαι 17, 43
ζόφος 21
θεή 36
θεοσύλης 85, 111
θριγκός 38-9
θρώισκω 66
ἰθύω 32
ἵλαος 7-8
ἱμερτός 66
καταχλύζω 19
κῆπος 39
κλαροπαληδόν 155
κόμη 50
ἐς κόρακας 42
κρήγυος 18
κτεάνη 154
κυκάω 120, 122
λαβόλιον 106
λαιμάω 78-9, 89
μάλα 43
μᾶλα 130
μελαίνομαι 37
μένος 49-50
μερίμνα 136
μήν 14
Μοῖραι 145
μύρμηξ 10-11
νεβρός 47
νεῖκος 139-40
ὄγμος 64-65
ὀξύς 44
παράφημι 47
πάρεξ/παρέξ 36
πελιδνόομαι 120-1
πέπων 41
πύλη 38-9
σαννάς 74-5
σάννος 74-5, 84
τηλεθάεις 45-6
φάος 21
φαρμακός 89-91
φάτις 6-7
φιλότας 139-40
φραδαί 156-8
χειρονομέω 77-8
χλαῖνα 46